Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XXV, No. 9. DECEMBER, 1935.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
ASSISTANT EDITOR: M. T. DUNLOP, M.A.

CONTENTS:

PAGE

The Dramatic Element in Christian Worship .. 484
The Editor.

Bishop Gore and Anglicanism 490
Professor Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil.

The 'Three Hours' Service 506
Dr. Percy Dearmer.

The Reformation and British Freedom .. 512
G. G. Coulton, D.Litt.

Book Reviews:
The Church on Trial 529
Milton 531
Ancient Civilization in India 534
Faith and Fact 535
The Care of Churches 536

Correspondence 537
A Parson in Revolt; The Resurrection and Psychical Research; etc.

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

AMERICAN AGENT:
MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

Two Popular Hotels in Central London

OPPOSITE THE BRITISH MUSEUM

THACKERAY HOTEL

Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1

NEAR THE BRITISH MUSEUM

KINGSLEY HOTEL

Hart Street, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C.1

200 Rooms in each Hotel Comfort and Refinement

Hot and Cold Water and Electric Fires in all Bedrooms
a number of which are fitted with PRIVATE BATHROOMS

BEDROOM, BATH AND BREAKFAST
FROM 8/6 PER NIGHT

Illustrated Booklet "Walks in Old London" on application

Telegrams:—
THACKERAY HOTEL: **'Thackeray, London'** KINGSLEY HOTEL: **'Bookcraft, London'**

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

All literary contributions should be addressed to:—
The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

All orders for advertisements should be addressed to:—A. DARBY'S ADVERTISING SERVICE, Cobham House, 24-26 Water Lane, London, E.C.4. (Telephone: City 6686-7).

Published on the 15th of every month except August, September and October. A Triple Number is published in October.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1935. Vol. XXV.

THE DRAMATIC ELEMENT IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

By the Editor.

ONE of the greatest of our English Deans, on being asked whether he was interested in liturgiology, replied: 'No, neither do I collect postage-stamps.' Nevertheless, liturgiology, or the study of the forms of Christian worship, has much to teach the student of religion. Religion did not begin with theology, but with ritual, so our anthropologists assert. Primitive religion was an affair of taboos and ritual. Taboos restrained freedom of action on every side, but ritual developed the religious and social life of the community. The community may be said to have become self-conscious just in so far as it participated in its corporate ritual.

The ritual varied greatly in different types of religion. The Totemistic rites of the worshippers of sacred animals consisted mainly in the imitation of the animals themselves. In national religions great events in their history were commemorated in the ritual: this was the case with the religion of later Judaism. In the Mystery cults of ancient Greece their ritual symbolized the

* *Liturgy and Society*. The Function of the Church in the Modern World. By A. G. Hebert. (Faber and Faber.) 1935. 12/6 net.

life-giving power of the Saviour-God in which the worshippers themselves shared by taking part in these rites.

It is this religious and social ritual, performed by the community or its representatives, which is the dramatic element in religious worship. The drama is religious in its origin: in the modern world it has become largely secularized, yet it still survives in a religious form in the ritual of Catholic Christianity. Cardinal Newman spoke of the 'sacred dance of the Mass'; others have spoken of its 'sacred chorus'; but the term sacred drama is both more true and more comprehensive. But not only is there the sacred drama of the Eucharist, there is also the sacred drama of Baptism and the sacred drama of Ordination and of Christian Marriage and other rites.

These elementary truths are recognized by Mr. Hebert in his attractive volume *Liturgy and Society*, and he uses them with much skill in his apology for Catholic worship.

Catholic worship is primitive Jewish-Christian worship developed and interpreted under the influence of the Greek Mystery cults and contemporary pagan ceremonies. This Catholic ritual is capable of analysis. One element in it is simply Christian and goes back to Jesus Himself and what He did or commanded to be done; other elements are Jewish; other elements are pagan. When it was remarked to Dean Inge that Catholicism is as old as Christianity itself, he replied: 'Yes, and a great deal older.'

In our Catholic dramatic worship there is, then, not only a Christian element but also a pre-Christian element, and we must add in some cases, a sub-Christian element. This sub-Christian element dramatically presented in certain forms of Catholic worship reflects religious beliefs which the Christian religion, as taught by Jesus, superseded or transformed. Not all of the dramatic element in Catholic worship, however interesting it be from the antiquarian point of view, can justify its claim to be retained in worship which seeks to be loyal to the specifically moral and spiritual ideals of Christ's religion. This was the issue on which Archbishop Cranmer and the reformed Church of England parted from the mediaeval Papal Church.

No understanding member of the Church of England can rightly object to the dramatic element in Christian worship pro-

vided that that dramatic element does really symbolize Christian truth. It was not ceremonies; it was 'dark and dumb ceremonies,' superstitious, magical and alien ceremonies, to which the English Reformers objected. The judicious Hooker, opposing, on the one hand, Papal ideals of Christian worship, and on the other hand, Puritan ideals of Christian worship, has provided for English Churchmen a firm basis which recognizes the importance of ceremonial in public worship but does demand that that ceremonial shall be expressive only of the truths of the Christian religion. In the effort which the Oxford Movement has made to stress and develop the dramatic element in our Church worship, too little regard has been paid to this important, indeed essential, aspect of the matter. A persistent effort has been made to bring back again into our Church worship, ceremonial usages which are reactionary and superstitious, and symbolize doctrines which the Church of England deliberately rejected on the ground that they were neither Christian nor conducive to the moral and spiritual development of those who took part in them.

There is very much in Mr. Hebert's able book with which we are in hearty agreement, but we are apprehensive that it may lend itself to the support of a reactionary ritual and doctrine. Such a result would prove disastrous. Hardly anything has done more to make English men and women 'abhor the offering of the Lord' than the reactionary ceremonial and teaching to which it has been united by clergymen whose zeal has not been according to knowledge.

There are several points which Mr. Hebert does not stress but which we think require to be stressed if sound practical results are to be achieved in the liturgical reformation of the future. The first is that a national Church ought to strive to provide forms of public worship which are to be of 'the greatest good to the greatest number.' It has to be recognized that for not a few of our Christian countrymen the dramatic element in Christian worship is not a source of inspiration, but an offence. These lay people are neither mystical nor aesthetic in temperament. They do not possess either the imagination or the culture which would enable them to find in ritual acts (with their appropriate aesthetic background) thoughts too deep for words. That

there are so many who cannot share in this experience is no reason why this type of public worship should be eliminated. It has its proper place and use — quite possibly a growing one in our developing national life — but we are certain that to try to make it general is simply to empty a large number of our parish churches and to drive our people into indifference or dissent as has already happened and is happening in probably thousands of our parishes to-day. For one Englishman attracted to our Church worship by the dramatic element introduced into it of recent years, it is not unjust to write that twenty have been repelled. Our English people are great lovers of simplicity, not only in speech and manners, but in public ceremonial. This taste has to be satisfied in our public worship, and the neglect of this has had, and is having, most detrimental results. This means that we must have various types of ritual sanctioned by our Church authorities and that our clergy must be brought to recognize that it is not their own particular tastes or predilections nor the wishes of a few people in the neighbourhood who share these tastes and predilections, which must determine the ritual in the parish church, but 'the greatest good of the greatest number.' Furthermore, that the type of ritual, where there is any difference of opinion, must be determined by the Bishop and the Parochial Church Council, and that it is the duty of the parish priest to adhere loyally to such decisions. The attempt to raise the ritual standard in the face of an unsympathetic or recalcitrant laity, however well-meaning, achieves no good result. There is no reason why two or more different types of ritual may not exist happily side by side in the same parish church, but a spirit of loyalty and tolerance is needful in both priest and people.

A necessary warning must be uttered. The clerical mind and the clerical taste in the matter of ritual very often differ widely from the lay mind and lay taste. *De gustibus non disputandum est.* The taste of the laity has to be carefully noted, and even if, on account of its extreme simplicity, it does not commend itself to the clerical taste, it must be treated with respect. We observe on all sides the disastrous effect of raising the ritual standard in accordance with clerical ideals where the great majority of the laity entirely disapprove of such alterations.

Mr. Hebert longs for the time when on every Sunday morning the central service of the parish church will be the Eucharist offered by the whole congregation as in primitive Christian times. This, be it observed, is a very different thing from the sung Mass with only three communicants and a congregation comprising not a tenth of the parishioners, which is becoming the custom in so many of our parish churches. Morning Prayer and Sermon which it seeks to displace is in its way a popular service; the early Communion is a popular service; the monthly mid-day Communion is a popular service but the Sunday sung Mass is not a popular service in normal English parishes. Its extension, therefore, except in parishes where the great body of the parishioners demand it, ought to be discouraged or even prohibited. As for a Sunday morning 10 or 11 o'clock non-fasting Holy Communion at which all communicated every Sunday, this we believe to be practically impossible of achievement save in very rare cases. It is quite true that it was the Church custom in the days of Justin Martyr, but is that a cogent reason for its being made the Church custom to-day in England? The late Dr. Swete warned his readers that primitiveness might be as deceptive a lure as mediaevalism. The English laity, as a body, have never communicated every Sunday, and the attempt suddenly to raise them to that level, especially in this age, can only lead to detrimental reactions. We ought to have in every parish church, every Sunday, various types of service which will help the moral and spiritual needs of parishioners who have reached different levels in the Christian life. We must have the early Communion service for some, to which, if they will, they may come fasting. We must have a monthly mid-day celebration for others. We must have children's services with catechisings and baptisms for others. We must have a popular and varied Evening Prayer and address. In this way we shall find, if other things are being done in the parish which ought to be done, especially regular visiting by the clergy, that the great bulk of the parishioners will, Sunday by Sunday, attend in their parish church, not the services perhaps their clergy most desire they should attend, but at least one service.

Earnest priests of a doctrinaire type should realize that the best is often the greatest enemy to the good and that the best, if

ever attained parochially, can only be attained very gradually. 'Vary the length of the bowling' and 'The more snares the more hares' are sound mottoes for pastoral work.

But there is one thing which all are apt to forget who discuss these ceremonial and liturgical problems, and that is that the Christian religion is not primarily and essentially a ritual religion at all. St. James wrote: Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world. And the word he uses for religion (threskeia) was the word normally used for religious ritual. Here St. James is saying that the pure and undefiled ritual of the Christian religion consists not of ceremonial acts but of the discharge of moral and spiritual duties. Our daily work is our daily worship. Our daily service to others is our service to God. Ritual worship, whether in church or elsewhere, is a means to an end, and that end, that in our daily lives we may offer the true worship Christ's religion demands.

BISHOP GORE AND ANGLICANISM

By Professor Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil.

'THIS prelate,' wrote Dean Inge of Charles Gore more than a quarter of a century ago, 'partly by his personal qualities—his eloquence, high-minded disinterestedness, and splendid generosity—and partly by knowing exactly what he wants and having full courage of his opinions, has at present an influence in the Anglican Church which is probably far greater than that of any other man. It is therefore a matter of public interest to ascertain what his views and intentions are as an ecclesiastical statesman, and reformer, and as a theologian.'[1] In 1908, when this tribute was penned, Gore had been Bishop of Birmingham only three years, and had still more than twenty years' of vigorous life to be fulfilled; and if he was then, in Dr. Inge's words, not only 'the strongest man in the English Church,' but also 'one of the most powerful spiritual forces in

[1] *Bishop Gore and the Church of England* (1908), reprinted in *Outspoken Essays* (1st series), p. 114.

our generation,' it may be affirmed with assurance that his subsequent fortunes increased rather than diminished his influence and authority. Nor may Dr. Inge's tribute be discounted as that of a flatterer; for he was 'profoundly antipathetic to much that Gore held sacred,' in particular to the Bishop's social opinions and his championship of Anglo-Catholicism, and viewed with anxiety not unmixed with apprehension the possibility of Gore's stamping upon the Church of his age the impress of his policy and convictions. It is with lively interest and anticipation therefore that the reader turns to Dr. G. L. Prestige's official biography[2] to seek a fuller answer to the questions posed by Dr. Inge as to the principles of Gore's activity as theologian, bishop, and spiritual director.

The story which Dr. Prestige has to unfold lacks some of the events which normally count for most in the lives of Churchmen in England. In the first place Gore was a convinced celibate, a circumstance which accentuated the profound reserve strongly implanted by nature and which cut him off from one of the most important aspects of human life. Further, he was a Religious, the founder and senior of the Community of the Resurrection, and throughout his adult life there was an unresolved tension between his vocation to the monastic life and the public office in the Church to which his abilities had called him. In addition his lineage, education, and family traditions opened to him opportunities of service and positions of influence which removed from his experience the obscurity and hardship of the majority of the contemporary clergy. On the other hand, Gore was richly endowed with talents and gifts, intellectual, social, and spiritual, which marked him out as a teacher and leader in the religious life of his age; and perhaps his chief problem was that of choice between the several opportunities of important position and service which came to him recurrently. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that he decided wrongly to accept the episcopal office and to submerge his undoubted genius as teacher and writer under the heavy burden of diocesan administration and responsibility, And if it may be permitted to doubt the wisdom of his acceptance of diocesan episcopacy for himself, there can hardly be any doubt that his removal from

[2] *The Life of Charles Gore,* by G. L. Prestige. Heinemann. 1935. 18/-.

Birmingham to Oxford was a mistake both from his own standpoint and that of the Church. It is difficult however in this connection to determine clearly how far the particular characteristics of the diocese of Oxford—its unwieldy size, its predominantly rural character (for Gore had not been a success as vicar of Radley), the general lack of sympathy between his prophetic outlook and the conservative traditions of the countryside, and the fact that in relation to the University he was but a non-resident D.D.—contributed to this result, and how far the theological controversies concerning the Modernist question stamped a character of misfortune upon what might otherwise have been a tolerably happy experiment. It is, however, clear that the resignation of the see renewed his vitality and spirits; and that the last twelve years of his life, marked by the composition of the great trilogy of *The Reconstruction of Belief* and by the freedom to teach and to prophesy, constituted a rediscovery of happiness and a period of invaluable service to Christianity and the Church.

It is interesting and important to notice the development concurrently and contemporaneously of the religious and intellectual faculties in Gore. At Harrow and Balliol his intellectual gifts were quickly recognized; whilst in religion, as he told his brother bishops many years afterwards, he had genuflected since he wore velvet breeches, and, what was of far greater importance, he had made his first confession as a schoolboy at the age of seventeen. As an undergraduate he became a member of the E.C.U. and the C.B.S.; and his intellectual convictions were so firmly and quickly established that his later writings were mainly the making explicit what had been implicit in the first principles of his faith. In 1890 (the year after *Lux Mundi*) he confessed to Talbot:

> 'I have really—to be honest—almost never had difficulties of belief; and it seems to me at this moment difficult to imagine how a good man really doubts our Lord's Godhead—though of course I can understand difficulties as stated piecemeal.'[3]

Meanwhile he passed rapidly from Trinity College, Oxford, as don, to the Vice-Principalship of Cuddesdon College, and thence to be first Principal of the newly-founded Pusey House; and all the time he scandalized political conservatives by the

[3] Prestige, *Life of Gore*, p. 126.

radicalism and social sympathies of his politics, visited India on missions of help and encouragement, became an active member of the Holy Party (from whence sprang *Lux Mundi*), and began the nucleus of the religious community which settled later at Mirfield. There followed the very brief parochial interlude at Radley, and Gore's nomination to a canonry at Westminster Abbey, where he became one of the most popular and forceful preachers and teachers of Christianity in the metropolis. It is to this period of intense activity as writer, speaker, and teacher that many readers of this biography will turn as to the fine flowering of Gore's character and genius. Certainly it was a time of industrious happiness; and though the offer of higher preferment was bound to come, the decision to accept nomination to the see of Worcester in 1901 marked the parting of the ways. Gore had already experienced some difficulties in his relationship towards the nascent monastic community of which he was founder and leader when he left Radley for Westminster; but the call of the teacher was even stronger than that of the recluse; and now that vocation also was to be subordinated to the labour of diocesan administration, financial organization, and the routine business inseparable from the office and work of a bishop in the modern world. To Gore the see of Worcester meant always the city of Birmingham; and within three years of his consecration, he became first bishop of the new diocese of Birmingham, where he remained six years until 1911. If anything could reconcile him to episcopal administration it would be residence in the midst of a great industrial city, teeming with social problems after his own heart, with a vigorous and intense civic pride and life, and moreover the seat of one of the strongest of modern civic universities. Here, with so many live issues challenging the utmost qualities of heart and mind, and with a diocese of manageable extent, he seemed about to settle happily and contentedly; and in Birmingham, next to Westminster Abbey, he achieved his best work. The episode of his Oxford episcopate, apart from the distractions caused by the Great War and its repercussion upon the life and work of the Church, was chiefly marked by the failure of his project for a dual division of the diocese, and the Modernist controversies. Not until his resignation did he recover the freedom of prophet and teacher;

and in London, at King's College, Liddon House, and Holy Trinity Church, Sloane Street, he became once again the counsellor, director, and instructor of a new generation of Churchmen, clerical and lay.

It is impossible to doubt that Gore's gifts were primarily those of teacher. 'The things for which he cared most deeply were teaching and ministry to individual souls.'[4] As a don at Oxford, at Cuddesdon and again at Pusey House, he drew undergraduates by the power of his mind and the spell of his character. Nor was this merely the zest of a young man. Dr. Prestige describes the success of his mission as Bishop of Oxford to the undergraduates in 1914, when he was already sixty years of age; and during the latest phase of his life in London after the Great War he laid his old stamp upon a younger host of men. The present writer owes the privilege of acquaintance with Bishop Gore to a chance conversation, initiated by the bishop, in the senior common room of King's College, when Gore was a member of the theological faculty and he himself a lecturer in history in the arts' faculty. The introduction was followed by an invitation to Margaret Street, by a few privileged visits to supper there, and one final visit to Eaton Terrace. Had he been bolder, he would have asked for more frequent opportunities of conversation; for the charm of Gore as teacher and the profoundly religious basis of his character were an experience not to be forgotten. In such ways Gore found an outlet for the human affection which had no family upon which to lavish its kindness, and the 'Cuddesdon cuddle' survived in these last years in London. Herein, as teacher and writer, lay Gore's strength; and though his episcopal championship of all causes of social distress, his fearless advocacy of reform in Church and State, and his courageous and outspoken criticism of the policy of the British Government during and after the war, establish a manifold claim on the gratitude of his fellow-Churchmen, they were perhaps purchased too dearly at the price of so long an estrangement from teaching and writing.

> 'You don't seem to realise that the Church of England is an ingeniously devised instrumentality for defeating the objects which it is supposed to promote.'[5]

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

The sentence might be from the pen of Canon Sheppard; but both sentiment and sentence were those of Gore.

> 'I do not congratulate you on your appointment,' he once wrote to a bishop-designate, 'I think it is hardly possible to combine the activities of being a good Christian and a good bishop.'

It is clear indeed that he disliked most of the episcopal administration.

> 'I am overwhelmed with the hideously vast task of organization before me. I HATE organization.

Yet having accepted episcopal office, it is as a bishop that he must be judged; and the change from teacher to governor was of profound importance not only for Gore himself but for the Church of England. As a bishop he was keenly conscious of the wider responsibilities of the episcopate to the Church Catholic and particularly to the Anglican Communion; and he brought to these duties an especially sensitive conscience and strong determination in the spheres of credal subscription and disciplinary regulation of liturgical variations. Had he remained a simple presbyter his theological influence might have been not less, but his conflicts would have been confined to literary controversy. As a bishop he was resolved to make his private opinions as a theologian the test of official orthodoxy. It is essential therefore to turn attention to the complex of problems comprehended under the designation of the Modernist question; and to consider Gore's theological position as a scholar and teacher and his endeavours to establish that position as the rule of orthodoxy in the Church.

At the outset Dr. Prestige encounters little difficulty in dissipating the legend that Gore suffered a sea-change from the unorthodox critic of *Lux Mundi* days to the *malleus haereticorum* of his episcopal years. The legend, if it still retains potency, has no basis in fact.

> 'Gore's attitude in *Lux Mundi* was entirely consistent with the convictions that he expressed both before and afterwards. He had always accepted the principle that for the purpose of literary and historical criticism, the books of the Bible should be treated like any other documents. He had always maintained, as was assumed in the preface to *Lux Mundi,* that official spokesmen of the Church, whether priests or lay theologians, were bound in loyalty to accept the facts of revelation declared in the Gospels and the great theological determinations embodied by the Church in its creeds, by which the Gospel facts were proclaimed and interpreted.' [7]

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 124-5.

Or again:

> 'The Church remained the seat of an authority that was valid and genuine. By it certain matters had been not merely speculatively propounded, but practically settled for all time. Had Gore ever found himself in serious conflict with this broad but decisive authority, expressed in the creeds, he would undoubtedly have ceased to teach and almost certainly have left the Church.' [8]

These interpretations are wholly consonant with Gore's declaration in regard to the controversy arising out of *Lux Mundi*:

> 'We cannot conceive that our Lord could have made statements upon subjects about which He was really ignorant — statements which are now known to have been false. Our Lord never seems in the gospels to allow us to think of Him as fallible in His teaching, any more than as peccable.' [9]

Dr. Prestige rightly sets forth his analysis of the basis of Gore's theological position in relation to *Lux Mundi* and the Bampton Lectures, for all Gore's later writings and his episcopal policy were but the further explication of these principles and their expression in practical administration. In 1896, in an address to the Shrewsbury Church Congress, he declared 'that no tampering whatever should be allowed with the unmistakeable teachings of the Creeds.'[10] In brief, the historical clauses of the Apostles' Creed must be interpreted only in their literal sense, no latitude of subscription being allowed; for to Gore what purported to be statements of historical events were either true in their literal sense or manifestly false; and their truth was guaranteed by the oecumenical acceptance and authority of the Church.

It was inevitable that the Modernist controversies should turn therefore upon the problem of the miraculous, and as inevitable that the two protagonists who found themselves in recurrent conflict should have been Gore and Rashdall. Both men had one fundamental characteristic in common, their belief in reason and the consequent resolve to adopt no conclusions which did not commend themselves to their critical reason. Neither Gore nor Rashdall could accept the pragmatist justification of a belief upon the ground of its being a useful adjunct to devotion. Hence between them there was the natural antagonism of two students professing the same methods of study but reaching opposite conclusions. The concentration of con-

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 128. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 116. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

troversy upon the miracles of the Virgin Birth and Physical Resurrection of our Lord was unavoidable; but whereas Rashdall's plea was for the recognition of the compatibility of a suspended judgment upon these two matters with sincerity of clerical profession, Gore (like the Bishop of London, though for very different reasons)

> 'made no secret either of his conviction that the Christian religion stood or fell with acceptance of the physical Resurrection of our Lord, or of his resolve to prevent any person who thought otherwise from entering the ministry of the Church.' [11]

Dr. Prestige opines that the differences between Gore and Rashdall were based upon philosophy.

> 'Gore's philosophy was based on the interpretation of a wider range of facts than Rashdall's . . . Do the supernatural experiences of religion explain the natural world, or does nature explain the alleged supernatural revelation of the Christian religion? That was the crossroad from which in contrary directions they took their departure.' [12]

It is impossible within the limits of this article to adventure an essay upon the theological matters which divided Gore and Rashdall (even if the mental furniture of a teacher of history were adequate to the task), but it is necessary to insist that amongst the range of facts which must be included in the problem is that of the intellectual atmosphere in which the Gospel traditions were transmitted. Gore laid much stress upon the differences between the canonical and apocryphal gospels in respect of their miraculous narratives, but refused entirely to allow that the process of development which is evident upon comparison of these two sources, may have been at work during the period before the Synoptic Gospels were committed to writing. Students of monastic chronicles cannot be unfamiliar with the mental atmosphere congenial to the growth and credence of miracle stories; and the question may not be ruled out of court as to the possibility of miraculous accretion during the period of oral transmission of the evangelical narratives.

> 'What I dispute,' observes Professor A. E. Taylor, 'is the right of any man, or body of men, to claim once and for all to limit the right to recognise the presence of the symbolic element to the case of certain specified articles and to exclude from active participation in the devotional life of the Christian community those who do not make the same precise restriction.' [13]

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 345. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 197.
[13] A. E. Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist*, II, p. 142 (*cf.* p. 113).

Further, Gore's position lies open to criticism on the ground that the Anglican claim for the veracity of the Creeds rests upon their foundation on the authority of Holy Scripture; and no invocation of the authority of the Church to establish the belief of Christians before the rise of the movement of historical and literary criticism, can be valid in respect of conclusions concerning the Bible resulting from the adoption of modern critical methods.

But whilst the controversies between Gore and Rashdall might have been left to academic determination in which field discussions between theologians might have been conducted without breach of unity, the problem became far different and more serious when Gore determined to use his episcopal authority to the uttermost to exclude from the ministry of the Church all persons unable to affirm unequivocally their belief in the Virgin Birth and Physical Resurrection of our Lord. In this new sphere of activity he encountered a deliberate and convinced opposition to his rigorist policy from no less a person than Archbishop Davidson. It is easy to dismiss slightingly, as Dr. Prestige does, the attitude of the late primate as lacking principle and being based solely upon expediency. But the view that 'Davidson sought primarily to maintain the institution by prudent and skilful statesmanship'[14] is belied by the evidence of the archbishop's own testimony. It is clear that he valued the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, and was resolved to safeguard freedom of theological study and discussion within its borders, from no motive of pragmatist expediency, but from conviction of its service to truth. Summarizing the aims of his primacy in January 1917 he wrote:

> 'If I were forced to put it in a single phrase, I suppose it might be described as a desire to assert in practice the thoughtful and deliberate comprehensiveness of the Church of England, as contrasted with the clear-cut lines and fences of demarcation which mark the rulings of the Church of Rome, and the corresponding, though quite different, rulings of protesting sects in England, Scotland, America, and presumably Germany in the seventeenth century and since.'[15]

Referring to the discussion of credal subscription in 1914, the Archbishop added:

[14] Prestige, *Life of Gore*, p. 365.

[15] G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury*, II, p. 795 (2 vols. Milford. 1935).

'This specific instance is only an example of what has been a continuous and deliberate endeavour on my own part to avert putting forth by authority "cocksure" definitions and boundary lines at a time when scientific thought and the growth of historical criticism render such action not dangerous only, but unreasonable. Under this head, therefore, I believe that I have contributed something to the maintenance and assertion of what I believe to be the true principles of thought within the Church of England and English Christianity generally.' [16]

And again:

'Summing it up, I feel pretty clear that I have, during my archiepiscopate, contributed steadily and with considerable effect to the maintenance of a reasonably comprehensive spirit in our Church's policy. Bishop Gore of Oxford regards me as perilously lax in what I teach and practise as regards the national character of the Church of England, a phrase to which he has a special antipathy. I am increasingly certain that the rigorist attitude is a mistaken one, and that we rightly inculcate and use an elasticity in these matters — an elasticity which I have sought not only to condone, but even to encourage in certain credal matters referred to above, wherein I have stood upon one side, and the rigorist bishops on the other.' [17]

The first conflict between Gore and the primate occured in consequence of the controversy evoked by the publication of *Foundations* and of Canon Henson's *The Creed in the Pulpit*; which books caused Gore, backed by the Bishop of London, to propose a vigorously-worded motion, the effect of which would have been to brand the essay of Canon Streeter on *The Historic Christ* in *Foundations* so far as it treated of our Lord's Resurrection as beyond the bounds of clerical orthodoxy. The final resolution of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation was the result of a compromise, and declared

'that the denial of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds goes beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation, and gravely imperils that sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the ministers of the Word and Sacraments.'

The essential point of the resolution (brought out with inescapable clarity by the Bishop of Chichester's biography of Archbishop Davidson) is the careful distinction made between suspension of judgment and deliberate denial. The primate stated plainly his inability to accept any resolution

'intended to have the effect of pronouncing loyal churchmanship to be incompatible with a readiness to allow any "reserve" or "suspended judgment" as to the manner of receiving and holding certain credal clauses which the impugned men willingly, habitually, and reverently use.' [18]

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 796. [17] *Ibid.*, p. 797. [18] *Ibid.*, I, p. 676.

In like manner Bishop Chase of Ely testified that

> 'the words "the denial of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds" were very deliberate . . . If we condemn, let us condemn denial — disbelief which is so assured that it expresses itself.' [19]

Finally Gore himself accepted this distinction and interpretation of the resolution, that it was intended 'to emphasize *denial* and not any less decided or emphatic state of mind.'[20] It is possible of course to make little, or light, of the distinction thus carefully drawn between an attitude of suspended judgment and denial, between an attitude which is unable to affirm and one which advances to definite denial. But to the present writer at any rate the position adopted by Archbishop Davidson and by him pressed upon the episcopate and carried in Convocation, presents a satisfactory settlement of the issue. For whilst on the one hand it gives official recognition to the legitimacy of a suspended judgment upon the miraculous clauses of the Creeds, on the other hand it emphasizes the duty of the Christian minister to set forward the positive aspects of his teaching instead of protesting its negatives.

Gore, however, despite his acceptance of the resolution, was determined to interpret it in accordance with his own rigorist principles; and an opportunity of first-rate importance arose for the testing of his influence in the nomination by Mr. Lloyd George of Dr. Henson, then Dean of Durham, to the see of Hereford in December 1917. Gore at once made up his mind to regard this as an *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*; and his endeavour throughout the controversy which succeeded was to use the nomination as a means to secure by administrative action that policy of exclusion which he had failed to carry by deliberation in Convocation.

> 'I think Dr. Henson falls outside the limits of tolerable conformity as recognized in our recent declaration in Convocation. I think we ought not to accept him as a brother bishop: I am in my own mind convinced that I cannot.' [21]

In such terms he circularized his episcopal brethren; but once again the archbishop barred the way to the triumph of anti-Modernist principles. Dr. Prestige omits unfortunately to quote in full Gore's formal protest against the nomination. The

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 681-2.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 688.

[21] Prestige, *Life of Gore*, p. 395.

Bishop of Chichester repairs the omission;[22] and it is significant that Gore gives at least five quotations from and references to *The Creed and the Pulpit*, one of the books which had caused his protest in 1913-4 and which presumably the resolution of Convocation had allowed by implication to be not incompatible with clerical orthodoxy. Into the details of the painful episode (especially painful for the bishop-elect whose thoughts should have been devoted to more eirenical matters), it is unnecessary to enter; they are fully set forth in Dr. Bell's biography of Davidson. It is clear that the primate was convinced that there was no reason against his proceeding to consecration; but the opposition was intense. In the opinion of the present writer, it is also plain that Dr. Henson emerges from the ordeal with credit and without impairing his essential consistency, as the exchange of letters between the archbishop and himself illustrates. Davidson composed a careful letter, referring to the disquiet expressed by Churchmen at the bishop-elect's supposed

> 'disbelief in the Apostles' Creed and especially in the clauses relating to our Lord's Birth and Resurrection. I reply to them that they are misinformed, and that I am persuaded that when you repeat the words of the Creed, you do so *ex animo* and without any desire to change them.'

The letter concluded with an invitation to its recipient that he should allow its publication together with a word of reassurance from himself. Accordingly Dr. Henson approved the publication of a reply, of which the following are the vital sentences:

> 'It is strange that it should be thought by anyone to be necessary that I should give such an assurance as you mention, but of course what you say is absolutely true. *I am indeed astonished that any candid reader of my published books, or anyone acquainted with my public ministry of thirty years, could entertain a suggestion so dishonourable to me as a man and as a clergyman.*'[23]

The last sentence, here italicized, was added by Dr. Henson to the draft prepared by the primate; and it is crucial. For it constituted a refusal to retract or recant any of his published statements upon which Gore's protest had been carefully based. The E.C.U. saw and seized upon this point, and demanded as the price of their satisfaction such a retractation. This was neither asked by the archbishop nor proferred by the bishop-elect.

[22] Bell, *Randall Davidson*, II, pp. 859-62.
[23] *Ibid.*, II, p. 874.

Gore, who withdrew his protest, had failed to carry such a restrictive interpretation of the Convocation resolution of 1914 as to exclude Dr. Henson from the episcopate despite the fact that the latter had made no withdrawal of any published work. Davidson's verdict was emphatic.

> 'I do not myself find in that Resolution interpreted either literally as it stands or in the light of the ample and weighty debate which introduced it, anything which leads me, as one of those who voted for it, to feel that I should be acting inconsistently in proceeding in due course to the consecration of Dr. Henson.' [24]

Scott Holland wrote to Gore of the new Bishop of Hereford:

> 'He is *consecrate* in *spite* of his negative criticisms. He is consecrate solely because he has a strong and positive creed to deliver.' [25]

This is, or should be, precisely true both of Modernists and Modernism. Their *raison d'être* is that they have a strong and positive creed to deliver. But it is equally important to note that Dr. Henson had withdrawn none of his negative criticisms.

It was in the conflict between Gore and Davidson upon the question of Modernism that Gore's failure to carry his policy was determined; for not once only was the Bishop of Oxford's threat of resignation — a recurrent *ruse de guerre* to emphasize the determination of his purpose — countered by the primate's threat likewise to resign if a rigorist policy were accepted by the episcopate. Further, Davidson set his own hand to the drafting of the vital clauses in episcopal declarations which safeguarded latitude of subscription. In the debates of May 1922 (after Gore's resignation of his see), the archbishop noted in his diary:

> 'The Convocation debates in the first week of May were of the highest importance on the subject of Modernism. In that matter I took, behind the scenes, a leading part. The Resolution passed by Convocation was in itself largely my own work, for the really important part of it was the recognition of the need of free enquiry, and this was wholly due to me.' [26]

The consistency of Davidson's attitude secured the triumph of his policy; and Gore returned to the field of literary defence, though here it should be noted that he offered no replies to the articles contributed by Dean Rashdall to this journal after the Girton Conference of 1921 in criticism of Gore's own Christology from the standpoint of patristic orthodoxy.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 876-7.
[25] Prestige, *Life of Gore*, p. 403.
[26] Bell, *Randall Davidson*, II, p. 1142.

It was a frequent lament of Gore that so little enthusiasm was aroused by his enunciation of the Anglican position as that of a liberal catholicism. But the truth was that he drew its boundaries so narrowly that the Church of England, had it followed his direction, would have shrunk to the proportions of the city of Zoar. 'If the Church of England had done all that he wanted of it, it might have become a smaller Church than it is, but it would certainly have been more outspoken in its witness.'[27] If, however, its voice had spoken in the accents of an Anglican *Pascendi*, it may be doubted whether the resultant intensity would have contributed to its task of Christianising the contemporary world. Nor was it only the Liberal Protestants who would have suffered at Gore's hands; the school of Liberal Catholicism, as represented by Knox and Vidler's *The Development of Modern Catholicism*, would have been equally extruded, for Vidler records with regret the fact that 'Gore and Talbot, two of the founders of the *Lux Mundi* school, took a prominent part in the attempt to suppress theological liberalism among the Anglican clergy.'[28] The episode recalls the comment of Dean Church to Gore upon the publication of *Lux Mundi* and the protest of Liddon.

> 'Your trouble is a heavy one—not so much on account of the mere opposition of L.'s views and yours, as because it may mark the beginning of a severance which is like the little crack in the glacier and may open out into a great crevasse.'[29]

These words were indeed prophetic; for the development of critical studies has created the crevasse, and Gore remained stationary on the conservative side of the first little crack.

Equally disappointing to him was his failure to carry with him in matters of liturgical use and ceremonial the Anglo-Catholic clergy of whom he seemed the natural leader. But his difficulties with them in matters of conformity to the Prayer Book and the regulation of Reservation were as great as those with the Modernists upon points of credal interpretation. In both respects also he failed to carry the episcopate with him; and though his objurgations against episcopal timidity were

[27] Prestige, *Life of Gore*, p. 125.
[28] A. R. Vidler, *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church*, p. 250.
[29] Prestige, *Op. cit.*, p. 104.

many, it is significant that a majority of his brethren found him too restrictive upon both issues.

These failures, however, belonged to Gore as an episcopal statesman. They do not touch his attractiveness as a man and a spiritual counsellor. It is a relief to turn from them to recall Dr. Prestige's portrait of Charles Gore the prophet, teacher, and pastor. Much of his work—his journeys in the East to establish contact with the Orthodox Church, his part in the Malines Conversations, his missionary visits to India—cannot be mentioned within the limits of a single article. Perhaps one of the most attractive of all pictures is that of him at Lausanne, fleeing from the heated atmosphere of conferences on the plea of his need of a rest, and being later found 'at a café, sitting alone at a table with a large mug of beer before him, and on his head a most disreputable cloth cap. "The beer," he remarked apologetically, "was so very good."'[30] It is such memories, and many others of a more serious character, that his friends and acquaintances will carry away from this biography as the faithful and true witness to a great prophet and teacher. Measured by the standard of Creighton and Davidson, Gore was certainly not a statesman-bishop nor an episcopal statesman. But remembered as one,

> 'the inward joy of whose spiritual life and faith coloured all his intellectual effort, and transcended every burden of practical employment, disappointed frequently, he was never disillusioned,'[31]

his contribution to the Church of his age will not fail of grateful and generous appreciation. Not infrequently has the *Ecclesia Anglicana* been the envy of other Churches by reason of the intellectual eminence of its bishops; and it is interesting to notice the record of a conversation of the French scholars Battifol and Grandmaison in 1921, in which the latter expressed the hope that Archbishop Davidson would

> 'make more bishops like Lightfoot. Battifol agreed and added Chase—to which Grandmaison replied: "Let us also add Gore."'[32]

Dr. Prestige has discharged a difficult task with credit and success, giving a sympathetic and lifelike picture of a great scholar-prelate. It is perhaps a misfortune that his biography

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 452.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 512.

[32] Bell, *Randall Davidson*, II, p. 1248, footnote.

has been followed so closely by the Bishop of Chichester's Life of Archbishop Davidson; not only because by comparison with the late primate Gore becomes inevitably a smaller figure, but also because Dr. Bell, having access to fuller sources of information, is able in important episodes in which Gore himself played a leading part, to give a more accurate account of events. But Dr. Prestige's volume stands upon its intrinsic merits. It is written in no colourless or neutral style, but reflects the author's vigorous prejudices. Perhaps the perusal of the Bishop of Chichester's chapter on 'Episcopal Appointments' may convince him that the evil of 'state-appointed bishops' is more apparent than real, in view of the facts that the prime ministers never made during the twenty-five years of Davidson's primacy 'a single appointment which they knew to be fundamentally objectionable to the archbishop,' that 'if the archbishop insisted that a particular person was wholly unsuitable for the office of bishop, no prime minister . . . ever persevered with his name,' and that 'there was no instance whatever of what could be fairly called a mere political job.'[33] This testimony disposes of some tirades against the iniquity of a state-appointed episcopate 'largely unrepresentative of the working Church and inadequately conscious of its real desires and difficulties.'[34] Dr. Prestige may take comfort also from the envy with which French Churchmen, well acquainted in their own Church with the type of bishop desired by himself, regarded the Anglican episcopate. In the English Church, Charles Gore was canon and bishop. In the Roman Church, freed from state oppression, it may be doubted whether his ecclesiastical career would have survived the publication of his essay in *Lux Mundi*. We may be glad that his efforts to stamp a rigorist character upon the *Ecclesia Anglicana* failed; and for his zeal for righteousness, individual and social, his personal talents, and especially for his completely self-sacrificing life and work, and for his influence as a pastor, we may say *Laus Deo*.

[33] *Ibid.*, II, p. 1237. [34] Prestige, *Life of Gore*, p. 430.

THE 'THREE HOURS' SERVICE

A PLEA FOR ITS ABOLITION.

By Dr. Percy Dearmer, Canon of Westminster.

MANY Churchmen of all schools, Catholic and Protestant, have for many years deprecated the use on Good Friday of the 'Three Hours' Service. Some have dropped it; but habit is a very clogging thing, and unfortunately many of our cathedrals, which ought to set an example of clean and loyal worship, still mark time along the old ways, and few have had the imagination to substitute something more worthy both of Church tradition and of modern scholarship. At the present day it is the latter element that has made the question acute. Those who are at all conversant with New Testament criticism know that the so-called 'seven words' raise problems of extreme difficulty, however much they may wish on Good Friday to shut their eyes to the facts. And it is a bad thing for religion when well-informed people come to church, and hear addresses which make them suspect either ignorance or insincerity in the preacher.

Our increased knowledge of the New Testament has deepened our understanding of Jesus and our reverence for him, and this has increased our repugnance to exploit his bodily sufferings and to treat the dying words collected from the four Gospels as if they were seven oracles. Nothing can be further from the noble restraint of those Gospels than the spirit which is created by the hymns habitually used at this service and the way in which some preachers have overlaid the service with thoughts and pictures derived ultimately from the sadism of the Counter-Reformation.[1] It was natural enough for the Jesuit Alfonso Messia to invent such a service in South America, as he did at Lima in 1732, and natural that it should spread in a land where dwelling on the physical aspects of the Passion was habitual, and become popular in Peru and Mexico; inevitable perhaps in that age that it should travel to Spain, the home of

[1] A characteristic well known to historians of Baroque painting and sculpture in Italy and Spain.

religious horrors, and thence to Rome itself. But it was unfortunate that the attempt should have been made to follow suit in England: this was about the year 1865, according to W. Benham. The original edition of Hymns Ancient and Modern in 1861 contained Faber's 'O come and mourn' as well as the Stabat Mater, but was innocent of a seven-word service; and it was not till the Revised Edition of 1875 that the words were all printed in their order, and with the unfortunate hymns that thereafter became associated with them. England on Good Friday was becoming even as Mexico; and for a while the idea of dropping the proper liturgical service and having seven or eight sermons appealed to a section of our sermon-loving people, or at least to the female portion of it, for indeed the Three Hours was never a man's service; though in its palmy days, as when Benham wrote of it in 1891, St. Paul's Cathedral was 'always filled from end to end at this service.'

Roman Catholic History.

The very name 'Three Hours Service' is misleading and has produced a general impression that the crucifixion lasted for three hours. This is indeed what the Roman Catholic Church requires its members to believe; for it laid these matters down long before the priority of Mark was dreamt of. The crucifixion, it declares, took place in the year 33, though the chronological authorities are convinced that the date should be about the year 27—so the 'holy year' was kept by the Pope in 1933. The crucifixion lasted for three hours, it has officially declared, though St. Mark tells us that it lasted for six. And the Fourth Gospel was written by the son of Zebedee, who was standing by the cross, and therefore must have known exactly what happened. It is this refusal to accept new knowledge that has caused the educated classes in France, Spain and Italy to drift away from the Church, and the people to set up governments which are opposed to it or indifferent. It would be a melancholy thing if the Church of England found itself in antagonism to the truth, by maintaining assertions which were quite naturally taken for granted in an unscientific era, but which are no longer considered tenable by those who have the best right to advise.

A good many preachers first felt the difficulty when they came to discourse on the text, 'Woman, behold thy son.' If the Fourth Gospel was written some seventy years after the event by one who was not present, it can hardly be taken as a valid correction of the Synoptists; they give quite plainly the names of the women who witnessed the crucifixion, and could not conceivably have omitted that of the Lord's mother if she had been present. St. Mark is very definite that there were some women, but that they were 'looking on afar off'; he gives certain names, and two of them bore the name of Mary, while one was Salome. The Maries were Mary Magdalene (who was mistakenly identified in the Middle Ages with the sinner-woman), and Mary the mother of James the Less and of Joses.[2] This we are told in v. 40; and in v. 47 Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses are mentioned again. What gave rise to the story in the Fourth Gospel we do not know; but Mary the mother of Joses might easily have been misread in later times as the mother of Jesus. On the other hand, the only woman who may have needed someone to look after her was Mary Magdalene, who had suffered from seizures and may have been delicate and alone. The mother of Jesus was certainly not in this predicament, for it is St. Mark again who tells us (vi, 3) that Jesus had four brothers and two or more sisters. They are not likely to have been dead so soon after, and one of them, St. James the Lord's brother, lived to preside over the Church in Jerusalem. However, the story came into existence; and this led in the later Middle Ages to the tendency to transfer the Passion from Jesus to his mother, the classical expression of waich is the hymn 'Stabat mater dolorosa,' dating apparently from the fourteenth century[3] (the earliest MS. being c. 1380), which was not

[2] Or 'Mary the daughter of James the Less and mother of Joses' (see *e.g.* Klostermann, *Markusevangelium*, 186, 188).

[3] The cultivation of false pathos appears in the fourteenth century, and increases with the decline of intellectual leadership in the Church. In its wake follows the humanist reaction, but also the macabre. 'Il semble,' says M. Mâle in *L'Art Religieux de la fin du Moyen Age*, 1908, p. 76, '*que désormais le mot qui contient le secret du christianisme, ne soit plus "aimer," mais "souffrir."*' The absolute reserve of early Christian art is in the most striking contrast with the morbid emphasis on the details of the Crucifixion and Passion during the last six centuries.

officially sanctioned or adopted into the Roman Breviary or Missal till the eighteenth century, in 1727. The preacher who accepts the atmosphere of the Stabat Mater has left the realm of historical truth for that of mythology.

The Catholic Tradition.

Is it not time that we all agreed to go back to the order of the Prayer Book, which is also that of Catholic tradition? In the Middle Ages, as in the Post-Reformation period, the great choir service and the reading of the Passion from the Gospels was going on at noon; and from twelve to three the churches were occupied in solid, Scriptural liturgical devotion. From the Pilgrimage of Etheria we learn that the same was done in the fourth century: from noon to three nothing but readings — the psalms of the Passion, lessons from the Apostles, the Prophets, and the Gospels, interspersed with collects appropriate for the day. The custom all over the Church was to keep Good Friday by two enhanced features, reading and intercession. This is surely sound modern psychology. It is certainly the method of the Prayer Book, where the special Good Friday collects and the great post-communion collects remind us that it is a day — not of egotism or sentimentalism or introspection — but a day of prayer for the whole world. If a long service be desired, it may be pointed out that the appointed Prayer Book services, taken in the fullest way, without any omissions, may last about two hours and a half, with a few hymns added.

Alternatives. I.

In churches where it may be desired to break away from the Three Hours' form but still to have a service from twelve to three, the Prayer Book order may easily be lengthened by adding (1) The singing of the Scriptural verses called the Reproaches; (2) Short explanatory introductions in the long Gospel, divided into sections for this purpose; (3) A modern litany, such as the Litany of Fellowship, which is a world intercession, or other litanies or prayers, such as can be found in the *Grey Book, or Short Services for Young and Old* (both published by the Oxford University Press), or in other books, and (4) A period of silence. This is one possible arrangement.

II.

For cathedral churches and for other places where a complete liturgical tradition is desirable, I know nothing more impressive than the full arrangement of Mattins, Litany and Ante-Communion as it is described in the Parson's Handbook and as we used to have it at Primrose Hill in the old times. I need not describe it here.

III.

An 11 o'clock service, consisting of the Prayer Book offices, simply rendered with hymns, and which may last an hour and a half or more, opportunity being given for people to come or go between the services: Thus:

(1) *Mattins* with a hymn before the Psalms, a hymn for the Anthem, the Five Prayers, and a third hymn at the end.

(2) *The Litany*, followed by Psalm 22 or a hymn.

(3) *The Ante-Communion*, with a hymn between the Epistle and Gospel, another before the Sermon, another during the collection. After the Church Militant Prayer, all the collects that are printed at the end of the Communion Service, the Blessing, and a final hymn.

IV.

In some parishes a more popular service has been found useful. Here is a successful example:

(1) General Confession, etc.; Psalm 22; 1st Lesson (by one reader); Psalm 51; 2nd Lesson (by another reader); Hymn, 'When I survey'; Lesser Litany and the Three Collects for Good Friday with the two Morning Prayer collects.

(2) *Ante-Communion.* After the Epistle, S.P. 124, 'A voice upon the midnight air'; The Gospel, first section; then S.P. 141, 'Throned upon'; second section (by another reader); then S.P. 139, 'It is finished, Christ hath known'; third section, (by a third reader).

Ante-Communion, continued. Before the Sermon, S.P. 127, 'My song is love unknown' (a beautiful hymn, and very popular); after the Sermon, S.P. 562, 'Lord Christ, when first,' concluding thus on the thought of world intercession.

This may be continued with the Church Militant Prayer, the last Collects and the Blessing.

In the above, it will help if each of the three sections, into which the Gospel or Passion is divided, is prefaced by a *very* short introduction bringing out the meaning of what is to follow. If the Five Prayers are said after the Mattins Collects, two more hymns can be introduced, *e.g.* S.P. 138, 'In the place of sorrow,' and 580, 'My faith looks up to thee,' another exceedingly popular hymn. If the whole concludes with a Blessing, this should, I think, be prefaced by the Collects at the end of the Communion Service.

I do not think the importance of choosing good hymns can be exaggerated; many that have been set down for Good Friday in the old books are almost unsingable; some of these, and several others, are deplorable and demoralizing, adding to the charge against us that more lies are told on Good Friday than on any other day of the year. Some which have much in their favour and are popular have theological defects which make it difficult to defend their use. Even 'There is a green hill' holds a doctrine of the atonement which few really think true at the present day, besides being quite unhistorical in its opening line; for there is no evidence that Golgotha was a hill and it certainly was not green, as was the hill outside Londonderry which Mrs. Alexander used to fancy to herself was like the place of the crucifixion. Ought we not to be more careful in what we say or sing? There are very many suitable hymns for Good Friday — indeed all those which are about the thought of intercession for mankind and for the coming of the Kingdom for which Christ died are appropriate; and there are others specially associated with Passiontide such as 128, 'O sacred head,' 129, 'Sing my tongue,' 130, 'The royal banners,' 134, 'When my love to God,' 99, 'Ah, holy Jesus,' 119, 'Take up thy cross,' and others besides. But it would always be well to read a hymn carefully and ask ourselves whether it is still quite true in the light of our increased realization of the goodness and love of God.

THE REFORMATION AND BRITISH FREEDOM

By C. G. Coulton, Litt.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

I HAVE three reasons for fixing this lecture at a time inconvenient to myself and, I am afraid, not very convenient to most of you here present. The first is that there has been for the last two months or so correspondence in the Cambridge Press which shows a wide and deep interest in this particular subject. The second is that Mr. Chesterton quite recently was chosen by the British Broadcasting Corporation to broadcast to thousands of hearers an address on the subject of 'The Liberty that Matters.' And thirdly, the fact that at this moment Cambridge has the privilege of offering hospitality to a large number of Roman Catholic teachers and students and clergy; and therefore I seize this opportunity, as I intend to publish this lecture in popular form, to give it at a time and in a place where, if by inadvertence I make any mis-statement of fact, I have the greatest opportunity of being corrected.

Mr. Chesterton, then, in his broadcast on 'The Liberty that Matters,' which you will find (textually revised by himself, of course) in *The Listener* for June 19th, began by arguing that 'our parliamentary and legal safeguards' in modern Britain were due to, and invented by, the Roman Catholic Church. He spoke of the system of election. Now, as a matter of fact, Christianity—and I suppose even Mr. Chesterton does not believe that the Roman Catholic Church existed before Christianity—Christianity, I say, was born into a world in which election had been the regular thing in towns and villages and everywhere for at least two or three centuries. Among the most interesting of the inscriptions at Pompeii is, as a matter of fact, an election slogan scratched on the wall.

When Mr. Chesterton goes on to emphasize his so-called fact and to say that 'Abbots were elected by monks long before politicians were elected by mobs,' he plunges still deeper into the mire. As a matter of fact, originally the Christians were not

fools, and they adopted a commonsense system of election which they found in the pagan world before them. Bishops, and very often even priests, were elected by their people; by those whom Mr. Chesterton is pleased to speak of contemptuously as the 'mob.' St. Ambrose and St. Cyprian were two of the earliest saints who recognized a certain limited primacy in the Bishop of Rome. Both were elected, you may say tumultuously elected, by their flocks. Nor is it even true that the Papacy, finding this system already existing, gave impetus to it. On the contrary, we find that the greater the administrative power the Popes got, the more did they use it to destroy free election. The freedom of election in the Abbeys began to give way before 1000 A.D., princes breaking it first, and then popes. In 1465 Pope Paul III estimated the number of Abbeys in which the election system had been destroyed during the past ten years at five hundred. In 1516 Francis I, a contemporary of our Henry VIII, made a concordat — an arrangement with the Pope. Incidentally, it is most important on the question of Reformation and Freedom to know what was going on in France at the time of Henry VIII. Francis was, perhaps, the most notorious adulterer on any throne at that time; but he did not want to marry any of the ladies with whom he was connected, and therefore never came into conflict with the Pope. On the contrary, Francis concluded an agreement with the Pope of that same time which was almost as fateful to the French Church as Henry's quarrel proved fateful to the English Church.

By that concordat, thenceforward the Kings of France and the Popes shared the spoils of the Abbeys. They put into the Abbeys, by mutual consent and by log-rolling, men of their own choice; so that finally 850 of the French Abbeys — four-fifths of the whole number — were in the hands of blood-suckers who in a large number of cases were not even priests, let alone monks. That is what the great French historian Montalembert described as 'the leprosy of monasticism.' That leprosy England was saved from by the religious revolution which we call the Reformation. As a matter of fact the Popes for some generations earlier had attempted to import this leprosy into England. They succeeded in Ireland thoroughly and in Scotland pretty thoroughly. Edward I gave them a rap on the knuckles at the begin-

ning of the fourteenth century, and the first time in English history in which this 'leprosy of monasticism' was definitely introduced was by Henry VIII, in collusion with the Pope, when he put Cardinal Wolsey, who was not a monk, into the rich abbey of St. Albans. So that you see Mr. Chesterton wandered himself, and carried as many of his thousands of listeners as believed in him because the Broadcasting Corporation had chosen him as a trustworthy person—carried them into the antipodes of truth. I cannot say the *exact* antipodes, because Mr. Chesterton's inflated and breezy style does not lend itself to exactitude in writing, even in error. A witty Frenchman once said of a friend of his, 'He is so inaccurate that one cannot pin one's faith even to the exact opposite of what he says.' But Mr. Chesterton does certainly take us somewhere into the antipodes, at any rate.

You must not forget that the popes and the clergy did over and over again give assistance to democracies in the Middle Ages. Christianity is a democratic creed in its essence, and those men who were paid for preaching Christianity were not so unchristian as to forget that altogether. The Popes and the clergy did help in the Middle Ages, at times, those whom Mr. Chesterton for his own convenience calls the 'mob'; and, even when Popes and Prelates fought for their own selfish class ends, even so they were useful as an opposition. They were opposed to lay politicians even more selfish than themselves, and it was useful that there should be the two parties in conflict with one another.

The autocratic Papal State of the Middle Ages was what is now known as the Totalitarian State—that is a state which brooks no rivals whatever within itself; and, again, which claims the right of spreading to States outside. The Popes of the Middle Ages claimed the right of deposing sovereigns if they thought that they could condemn them for apostasy, and that right, you will see, is claimed by the Roman Catholic Church even to-day. Fisher and More were born into what is now called a Totalitarian State. The laity were very often restive under this Totalitarian State, but in the main there was a reasonable partnership. The State was willing to help the Church and the Church was willing to help the State where their in-

terests coincided. But, in this partnership, what liberty was there for the individual? What share had the individual in what Mr. Chesterton calls the 'Liberty that Matters'? You will find in Mr. Chesterton's article that one of the prominent things among the liberties that matter is the liberty of unlimited beer and unlimited betting. You have only to read his own article and you will find that I am not misrepresenting him there. That is one of the main points in his Liberty that Matters. That question we may leave alone here, but in what more important ways was man's liberty controlled in the Middle Ages before the Reformation? How did the multitude of those days differ from the modern multitude? Mr. Chesterton, on the subjects of drink and betting, demands that we should put ourselves out of our own skins and into the mind of 'the ordinary poor Englishman —the navvy, or the porter, or the bricklayer.' I am choosing, then, the analogies of these men in pre-Reformation times.

Of these men in pre-Reformation times the enormous majority would have been peasants on the land. These formed something like 90 per cent. of the whole population. Among these peasants, until towards the end of the Middle Ages, the majority were called serfs. Not only their land did not belong to them in the strictest sense, but a certain person was their landlord, and he was also the lord of their person in a sense entirely unknown to modern civilization. It is possible, especially towards the end of the Middle Ages when men had had time to force their way forwards, that some of the serfs had acquired a little land and even perhaps had a few labourers under them, but all of them were tied to their master by birth. If a serf ran away from his master he could be apprehended and imprisoned as a criminal. Of political rights he had none whatever. Here are the words of a great French historian, Siegnobos, speaking of his own Burgundy, one of the most civilized corners of Europe:

> 'The serfs formed the class upon which active society was founded, yet they formed no part of that society . . . The peasants have no place in mediaeval society . . . They do not count as a body; and, even when Government wants to take their money, it is not they who are consulted; they are not told to elect representatives; but Governments turn to the lords for leave to tax their men . . . "Such persons" (says a mediaeval lawyer) "are only chattels belonging to the lord."'

They were in fact the chattels of the lord. Even their families

are not spoken of in mediaeval language as 'families.' The family is spoken of as the 'brood' or the 'litter' of the peasant; as his *sequela*, not his *familia*. If a peasant's daughter wanted to marry outside the Manor, the serf had to pay a fine because the daughter's brood would be lost to the Manor. If his son was to be sent to a grammar school, he had to pay a fine again; since the boy thus became a clergyman and escaped from servitude. When the peasant worked in harvest time he worked under the overseer's rod — an overseer appointed by his lord. When he died, if he had possessed three cows, one went to the lord as death-duty and one very often went to the parson also. In a case of that kind, where the peasant had two or three cows, what was paid to the lord and priest amounted to at least 50 per cent. as death-duty. If you will consult Whitaker you will find that you yourselves will need to pay 50 per cent. death-duty to-day only when you leave a million and a half. No! I am wrong. You pay only 45 per cent. on a million and a half. It is only at two millions that you pay 50 per cent!

Now, against that system of mediaeval feudalism there was only one philosopher who protested firmly on principle; and that was *the heretic Wyclif*. The clergy, it is true, preached that it was godly to give freedom. They persuaded other people to free at their own expense these poor chattels, but the clergy themselves did it very seldom indeed, and whenever they did it you may nearly always prove that they did it for money. The consequence was that it was on Church lands, and most of all on Abbey lands, that serfdom remained longest, and especially on the Continent. In France it lasted even down to the Revolution in some places. In addition to that, the serf had to put up with the scorn of his fellow-men. I may be permitted to take two quotations from a book of mine which I have at present in the press: the third volume of my *Five Centuries of Religion*.

> 'A Chronicler writes concerning Queen Blanche, the mother of St. Louis, "since she had pity on the folk who were serfs, she ordained in many places that they should be freed and pay some other due. And this she did partly for the pity she had on girls of that condition, for that men would not take them to marriage, and many of them were deflowered."'

Again:

> 'In 1472, a poor servant-girl of Champagne, convicted of child murder, excused her misconduct by pleading that she had not been

able to marry after her own heart; her father had refused to unite her to "the man she would gladly have taken" because he was a serf.'

Nor can we even plead in favour of these men that society at that time was not disfigured by the Puritanism which some people object to in parts of modern society. Sunday labour was punishable in the Middle Ages. It was strictly forbidden. I have quoted in print the case of an archbishop who, journeying on St. Matthew's Day — not only on Sundays but also on all the red-letter days of the Church labour was forbidden — he passed a man ploughing, and he confiscated the horses until the man paid a considerable fine. Then, again, the dance (contrary not only to modern ideas, but also to what journalists write and repeat from one to another) was banned in the Middle Ages except on special occasions such as when your nation had won a victory; and not only in the Middle Ages but long beyond; and even to a certain extent in the Roman Catholic Church of to-day. The saintly Archbishop Fénelon, when talking to a village curé who congratulated himself on having at last put down the village dance in his community, was broad-minded enough to reply, 'Monsieur le Curé, do not let us do that. Do not let us take away that which makes them forget once a week that they are unhappy.' It is perfectly true that, in spite of the law, people were constantly at work on Sunday in the Middle Ages, and that the village dance was constantly carried out, and a great deal of contumely was brought upon authority in consequence. The fact is that the Middle Ages were very much in the condition of modern America. There was prohibition and there was boot-legging — any amount of prohibition and any amount of boot-legging — with the result that it brought the authorities into contempt. The Emperor's envoy Chapuys in London wrote to his master in 1529, 'Nearly all the people here hate the priests.' St. Bernardino of Siena was not only one of the greatest scholars, but perhaps the greatest preacher of the fifteenth century. He writes:

'Very many folk, considering the wicked life of monks and friars and nuns and clergy, are shaken by this — nay, oftentimes they fail in faith and believe in naught higher than the roof of their own house . . . They despise the sacraments of the Church, hold that the soul hath no existence, neither shun vices nor respect virtues, neither fear Hell nor desire Heaven, but cling with all their hearts to transitory things and resolve that this world shall be their Paradise.'

I can quote you even stronger words from his contemporary, St. Antonino of Florence, who had probably heard more confessions than any man living at that time. The towns, again, were not much happier than the country districts. There was not very much obstacle to settling in the town; but to become citizens and to get the privileges of the town was a very different thing. Unless you did so you could not keep a shop, but must do the best you could in the open market-place. Then, again, let us consider the guilds, which we are so often told ought to be given back to us. Many of the restrictions of the guilds were certainly useful. They were nearly all intended to benefit people, and some of them did. But these well-meaning people brought in regulations which could be turned against themselves; and thus, before the Middle Ages were over, not only were many of the guild regulations a restriction on the work of the trade they were meant to help, but they were definitely turned into anti-democratic channels. In a large number of places it was made so difficult for an apprentice, even when he had gone through his seven years, to become a member of the guild that it was practically impossible.

But worst of all was the ban on free speech, and, by implication, practically on free thought. A Redemptionist of our own day, an orthodox Roman Catholic, Father Godts, published a book under the title, 'What did the ancient Saints teach concerning the number of those that shall be saved?' I have the book here for anybody to consult who doubts it. I have not been able to secure a third copy for reasons which it is very difficult to explain. That book has become unprocurable. With great difficulty I have got one copy for myself and one for the British Museum, but I am still seeking a third copy for the University Library here. He shows by exhaustive quotations how, all through the Middle Ages, it was assumed as an axiom that the majority of human souls would find their way to Hell — that is to an eternity of indescribable torment. He shows that the contrary belief only grew from the heretics, and especially from converted Anglicans such as Manning and Faber. He shows how, on the first occasion on which any book of any importance tried to argue to the contrary, and pleaded that after all the majority of people might go to Heaven, that book was banned

by the Roman authorities. Well, now, granted that belief, put yourselves into the place of these pre-Reformation people. Imagine that we, in this room, all believe that the thing that matters most is whether in the person's last moment he believed in the Roman Catholic Church, and you will see that from that beginning the Inquisition follows as a matter of course. If it were true that all of you believed these two things, you would necessarily believe that the person who killed me at this moment would save a large number of souls; that he would put a pestilent plague-spot out of the world; moreover, a religious plague-spot, who deserves worse than death. As St. Thomas Aquinas says, 'Heresy is a worse crime even than murder.' From that followed, by practical necessity, the Inquisition with all its damnable regulations. It has been argued that there is no regulation in particular, among those that the inquisitors practised, which was not known also to other courts. That is mainly true, though it is not strictly true. But it is also true that there is no other court in the world which has ever united together in itself all these invidious items. The man who invented the Inquisition was very much like the man who invented gunpowder. When the Pope, in 1233, invented the Inquisition he was doing what the man who invented gunpowder did. He took saltpetre from one place, and sulphur from another and charcoal from yet another, and the mixture made gunpowder, a thing which had never existed before. In much the same way was the Inquisition invented. The procedure was secret in the Inquisition. You might not know even the man who accused you, or who the witnesses were. The judges accepted criminals as witnesses against you. Torture was introduced not only to get what they wanted out of you, but they also tortured their witnesses. Even children were brought in to bear witness against their parents. Here again, just as England was saved from the leprosy of monasticism, so she was saved from the leprosy of the Inquisition for a considerable time. It was only in 1311 that the Pope, wishing to destroy the Order of Templars in this country, and having got the evidence he needed against them in France through torture, and the English king having failed to get evidence against the Templars because torture was not allowed under the laws of England, therefore the Pope wrote to Edward II and said

to him, 'You must break down the English law and must accept our law.' He broke down resistance by a bribe and a threat; and from that time torture was allowed as a principle. Whether the Templars were actually tortured in England or not we do not know, but search in your own hearts for the answer. If we all knew that we should be tortured unless we confessed certain things, how many of us would be sturdy enough to bring matters to that point? With how many of us would the mere threat not be sufficient? Thus, at last, it was possible to find sufficient evidence against the Templars to destroy their Order in England also. The Inquisition itself and, I think, torture in any form, were never brought into England again until Mary's reign.

Thus there was in those days what there is still in theory, a definite conflict between the laws of the Roman Church and the laws of this country in some respects; and in those days, as now, the principle was laid down that wherever these two came into conflict the Pope's law must prevail. But in regard to the particular question of burning for heresy, as apart from torture, there was no difference for a long time between the State and the Church. In 1401 it was the King and Parliament who brought in burning for heresy and made it a part of the law of the land. From that time forward anyone who was a pertinacious Nonconformist might be burnt. He was condemned if he preached without a licence from the Bishop; if he wrote anything against the Church; held meetings in which the Church was criticized; or kept a school which the Church disapproved of: for all school teaching was in the strictest sense in Church hands. Again, if a man were merely suspected, he might be imprisoned, and the onus of proof would fall upon him: he would be put in prison until he could prove his innocence. Let me read to you what Lord Acton, by far the greatest Roman Catholic historian who has ever written in the English language, said about the Inquisition:

> 'There is much to deduct from the praise of the Church in protecting marriage, abolishing slavery and human sacrifice, preventing war, and helping the poor. No deduction can be made from her evil-doing towards unbelievers, heretics, savages and witches. Here her responsibility is more undivided, her initiative and achievement more complete . . . [The Inquisition] was the negation not only of religious liberty, which is the mainspring of civil, but equally of civil

liberty; because a government armed with the machinery of the Inquisition is necessarily absolute.'

That, then, ladies and gentlemen, was Fisher's and More's and Henry VIII's England. Always there was this divided allegiance, always the possibility of a mortal quarrel between the King and the Pope, and with it mortal peril for everybody in England who had a conscience. To make up your minds one way or the other was equally dangerous. We all know, and regret with tears, what Henry VIII did to More and Fisher; but I wonder how many people here know that, within a few months of their execution, Paul III declared war on Henry VIII and promised slavery as a punishment for any Englishman who should be found fighting for Henry against him. Fisher (I say it with regret as one who counts it among the greatest benefits of his life that he enjoys some of the revenues which Fisher, even more than Lady Margaret, was responsible for bringing to St. John's College), Fisher, I say, was in treasonable correspondence wtih the Emperor, although Henry VIII did not know it. But, in spite of that, he was a very great and good man; and St. Thomas More (I call them saints without hesitation) was one of the greatest Englishmen that ever lived. But put it in this way; that St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More were really quite as good as St. Latimer and St. Ridley who died on the other side, and whose conscience compelled them to side with the King against the Pope.

PART II.

Now we come to one fact of immense significance. This intolerance that I speak of is perhaps the only matter of importance for civilization in which the Roman Church had not improved from generation to generation until the Reformation. In that particular respect it had gone back. First, look three hundred years *backward* from Henry VIII. For three hundred years at least, since 1233, the law had said that the Nonconformist must be burnt; and this law was enforced even more strictly on smaller people at the verge of the Reformation, and just after, than it had been before. Now, look three hundred years *forward* from Henry VIII. Three centuries onward from the Reformation brings us down to Catholic Emancipation,

when the people of England, without passion and in pure generosity, abolished the penal laws; and again to the really great Parliament of 1832, which saw the beginnings of the popular liberty of our own day. The immense change, then, had come to pass in the three hundred years after the Reformation. But some of you may say, '*After* is not necessarily *on account of*: it may be *post hoc* and not *propter hoc*.' The best line in answer to that is to compare the present state of Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic countries; and I take Mr. Chesterton's leave not to compare them mainly on matters of beer and betting —although even on that particular point you will find that Mr. Percy Scholes, writing from Switzerland (and he is a learned student of history) shows that Mr. Chesterton is not right even in that field, and has managed even there to get into the antipodes of the truth.

Let me begin with the words of Mr. Chesterton himself, when he was a very brilliant young man of thirty and before he had joined the Roman Catholic Church. He wrote on this particular subject of Liberty:

> 'One of the most important steps ever taken in the history of the world is the step of deciding, in the face of many serious dangers and disadvantages, to let everybody talk . . . The theory of free speech, that truth is so much larger and stranger and many-sided than we know of.'

At those last words I will break off for a brief comment. When it is cast in your teeth that you are Protestants, and that Protestants disagree among themselves, and that if you find a dozen Protestants you will not find that each of them will repeat word for word the same creed as the other, then ask your interlocutor first, whether a dozen men of science will on a given subject all repeat the same form of words as if they were printed on their minds; and ask secondly whether Mr. Chesterton may not have been right thirty-one years ago in those words with which I may now continue in my reading from him. He wrote:

> 'The theory of free speech, that truth is so much larger and stranger and many-sided than we know of, that it is very much better at all costs to hear everyone's account of it, is a theory which has been justified on the whole by experiment, but which remains a daring and even a very surprising theory. It is really one of the great discoveries of the modern time; but when once it is admitted it is a principle that does not merely affect politics but philosophy, ethics and finally poetry.'

That is what Mr. Chesterton wrote in 1904.

For the reason why these three hundred years have wrought changes, which the preceding three hundred or four hundred years had not even begun to work, is because the Protestant who persecutes is breaking his own principles. Now, unfortunately, there have been a large number of persecuting Protestants; and I will freely grant that in the sight of God a persecuting Protestant is more guilty than a persecuting Roman Catholic. For the Protestant does so in spite of what he professes; the Roman Catholic does it because in logic he must do so. The fact is that intolerance is still inherent in the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, and it has been asserted numbers of times, but three times at least on three important occasions, within the present century, at Rome itself. In 1910 a distinguished Professor at the University of Rome, Alexis Lépicier, wrote a book which earned for him a special commendation — a very long commendatory letter from Pope Pius X not only for the person but for the book. In that book he maintains the old Roman Catholic tenet that every baptised person is a subject of the Pope of Rome. Everyone of you here that is baptised — *i.e.* probably every person in this room — is a subject of the Pope; and the Pope has the right, as apart from the expediency — mark very definitely here the difference between the *right* of doing a thing and the *expediency* of doing it — as apart from expediency, the Pope has the right of punishing every one of us for not becoming Roman Catholics; and in certain conditions even, by implication, punishing to death. Lépicier, then, wrote that even in 1910. Has it been disavowed since? (By-the-by, I should have added that he also points out that the Pope has still the right of deposing 'apostate' sovereigns of any State whatever in Christendom.) Not only have these two things not been disavowed, but Lépicier was made a cardinal afterwards; and, at the present time, Cardinal Lépicier is Papal Legate to the British Colony of Malta. The Governor-General of Malta offered him his own yacht to carry him from Italy across the Straits into the Bay. The Cardinal (to quote from the Roman Catholic *Universe*) had to decline it 'owing to its limited accommodation,' which was not enough for a Cardinal of Rome. Therefore he was escorted into the Bay by two British destroyers, and was met by a British Guard of Honour which saw

him safely to his lodging. Lépicier in his book had claimed, with perfect truth, not only that he was teaching what he had heard as a pupil from his old master Cardinal Tarquini, one of the principal lecturers at the University of Rome, but also that he was following the teaching of his predecessor, a Professor in Rome, De Luca. Now it is perfectly true that in 1917 a new Codex of Roman Church Law was published. In that Codex you will find, in the sixth canon, that all penalties are now abrogated except those mentioned in the Codex; and in the 2,400 odd paragraphs of the Codex, as far as I remember, you will not find any mention of bodily penalties or death. But on the other hand you must bear in mind that this Codex was, so to speak, simply a stroke of the pen of the Pope; that the Pope needs nobody's authority and need not even ask anybody's advice for any law that he promulgates; and that the present Pope, by a stroke of the pen this very night, might restore the old penalty of capital punishment for us Nonconformists; a law which not only has never been formally abrogated, as I say, but which Lépicier could appeal to as answering to the regular practice of the past, and which has been repeated also by Cardinal Billot in the year 1921. You have these three people in this century. And, as I say, one of Lépicier's strongest grounds is that not only the teaching of his Church in the past, but the practice of his Church in the past, is entirely in the direction which he indicates. Nobody can deny that, so long as the Roman Church had power to do so, it put heretics to death; and, as Lépicier perfectly rightly says, to abandon the claim now would be a 'severe blow to the inerrancy of the Church.' This shows plainly what the theory is. It would be a very severe blow to the principle of infallibility in the Roman Church if she ever gave up her claim to the *right*, as apart from the *expediency*, of punishing heretics even with corporal punishment.

Another equally important point is that of the Roman *Index*. Here is the book in my hand. Even the present Pope, who, having been a great librarian, might be expected to have the greatest mercy on books, has republished that *Index of Prohibited Books* in which some thousands of volumes, including some of the greatest classics in the world, are forbidden in the first instance to all true Roman Catholics. The prohibition extends

'to all good sons of the Church . . . who (apart from cases of real necessity, for which the Holy See is wont to give dispensation) will always scrupulously observe all the rules of the Index, abstaining from reading, and even from keeping in their possession, the books which Holy Church forbids.'

In that *Index* (I will just name a few of the books) practically all the greatest philosophers of modern times are strictly forbidden: Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Kant, J. S. Mill,; some of the greatest historians: Gibbon, Acton, Sabatier's *Life of Francis*; great men of of letters such as Montaigne, Bacon, and Victor St. Hugo; the Book of Common Prayer and all non-Roman Bibles. These may suffice as specimens. American Prohibition itself, in the Volstead law, was not more sweeping than that. Yet here again we have boot-legging in Britain as we had it in America. A Roman Catholic, who signed himself 'Romanus' (I believe he was the late Dr. E. J. Dillon) wrote in the *Contemporary Review* of 1897 a criticism of the edition of the *Index* which had just come out by Pope Leo XIII. He was answered in a very long and violent article by the best-known and most pretentious of Roman Catholic weeklies, *The Tablet*. This article explained how all orthodox Catholics knew that there was practically, though not publicly, permission for everybody in Great Britain to read what they liked, in spite of the *Index*: and here I call special attention to the reason which *The Tablet* gave for this permission. Why should it be poisonous (you will ask) to read in Italy books which may be read without danger in England? Because (says *The Tablet*) Great Britain was not like 'Italy and the Continent generally' where there was 'the flood of bitterly anti-Christian literature, often infidel, immoral and blasphemous'; or, again, 'that widespread prevalence of aggressively anti-Christian and pornographic literature.' The reason is, therefore, that (for some otherwise unexplained cause) the Roman Catholic countries in which these great philosophers and historians and essayists have been forbidden are a hot-bed of pornographic and anti-Christian literature; and England, on the other hand, is so free that the English people are permitted wholesale 'bootlegging.'

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I will ask leave to quote from my own personal experience in different countries.

I was at school at St.-Omer in France, at a French lycée. I was a boarder there under the Second Empire, the most clerical

and strongly Roman Catholic Government that France has had in the lifetime of anybody living at the present time. The last thing I saw at St.-Omer in 1867 was a boy being run off to the school prison for having played the Marseillaise on the school piano. That was the freedom in France under Catholicism. In 1914, again, I was under commission to go and make certain researches among the Socialists of Belgium. They assured me with one accord that it was practically impossible in Belgium to be a Socialist and a Roman Catholic. Again, in 1921 or 1922 I was in Italy during that election which first put the Fascists quite beyond contest at the head of the Government. I went to one of the election meetings in the public square. When I came back I remarked to my host that, in spite of the extraordinarily inflammatory and partisan speech of the speaker, among all the hundreds whom I saw there, not only nobody had the boldness to heckle the speaker, but I could not trace even an open sign of disapproval on one of their faces. My host said, 'Of course not: even a simple sign of disapproval might have cost the man considerable physical violence or, possibly, even his life.' Lastly, a few weeks ago I was in Roman Catholic Austria. There was an extremely intelligent youth there of about 25 or 26 with whom I was anxious to talk politics, and who was anxious to discuss politics with me. In order to do so we rowed out in a little boat into the middle of the lake by moonlight; and there, a quarter of a mile from the shore, he felt able to talk freely with me.

Now, there has been a considerable noise made lately about the disturbances in Edinburgh, Belfast and Liverpool — disturbances in which, so far as one can judge by the reports, it was about six of one and half-a-dozen of the other. Those have been most regrettable disturbances, but let us turn from the disturbances in these Protestant parts to the disturbances in a country in which Protestantism has never been known since that country existed. I quote here from *The Universe* of June 28:

> 'The facts make it plain that Spain left in Mexico perhaps the greatest civilization that ever existed. It is plain that the Catholic Church built in Mexico an educational system and social and charitable works that have never been excelled.'

Well, just for the sake of argument, we will take all that as absolutely true; but how it is that this occurs in an article headed 'Blood-drenched Altars,' and that this is the title of a book of

Bishop Kelly upon Mexico, and that the article ends (it is thoroughly worth while to buy the paper and read this) with nearly a column of parallels to England; descriptions of life as we should find it if what is happening in Mexico were transported to Britain? I need only read the first sentence: 'The Church of England would not be permitted to own any buildings nor property of any kind.' Again, in the *Catholic Herald* of June 5 you will find a similar article. Listen to the mere headlines: 'Mexico's Wave of Barbarism'—'Horrible Limits of Bolshevism'—'Spiritual Murder'—'Protests Forbidden'—'Gagged Press'—'Organized Gangs'—'Shooting down Worshippers.' In the same paper for July 19 there was an article pointing out that 60,000 members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians had sent a petition to our Foreign Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare (a good Quaker, I believe) to beseech him to interfere for the Roman Catholics of Mexico against those wicked Mexicans who had never been touched by Protestantism. If we, like Mexico, had this model Roman Catholic education, would it end in Britain as it has ended in Mexico and in Spain? I lay emphasis on this point because the new Archbishop of Westminster (Archbishop Hinsley) has mentioned it as the chief line of his policy—and all honour to him for his convictions in attempting it—that he means to get Roman Catholic schools in far greater numbers for this country, and at greater expense than we have ever been able to grant yet. In Scotland they are already very much more widely spread; and even in England and Wales they have privileges which it would be absurd for them to ask for even in nominally Roman Catholic states. They claim it here in the name of English justice. Let me reverse the position and ask whether it would be truly just if Roman Catholics, instead of being less than 6 per cent. of the population of this country, were 94 per cent.? If we were less than 6 per cent. and the Roman Catholics nearly 95 per cent., would their principles allow them, would they let us in the name of 'ordinary justice,' as from citizen to citizen, demand that they should heavily subsidize schools which the six per cent. demanded, for the purpose of teaching a law which claimed to be superior to the law of the State, claimed to have a hold on every baptized citizen superior to that of the law of the State? They know perfectly well that no Roman Catholic would allow that,

and that it would be directly contrary to Roman Catholic principles. Intolerance is foreign to our principles; and just as, personally, I am ashamed of every intolerant Protestant, so I must recognize that it is an essential Roman Catholic principle, and I have no blame for the Roman who is intolerant within these bounds. They know perfectly well that we shall afford to indulge them as far as we can, simply because we know the strength of feeling among us. Yet already there is friction, and there would be very much more if there were a stronger growth of this sectarian education — I use the word advisedly, since, as a matter of fact, the Roman Catholics are simply a sect to-day. If this sectarian education were magnified, there would be still greater friction, and the incompatibility between Church and State would become a still greater danger.

In 1318, about the time when the first nucleus of Trinity College was founded, the Pope burnt publicly at Marseilles four Franciscan Friars on the ground that 'obedience is better than sacrifice.' If you will look carefully into the verdict you will see that these men honestly believed and pertinaciously held that they were loyal to the principles of St. Francis himself, and they refused obedience to their Franciscan Superior who wished them to adopt other and newer principles. The Pope, as I say, burnt them and called upon them to admit a principle borrowed from the Old Testament, a principle very dear to the ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages, taken from the words of the Prophet Samuel in rebuke to King Saul: 'To obey is better than sacrifice.' Protestantism takes its stand essentially on two texts of the New Testament — the first, St. Paul's words to the Thessalonians: 'Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good'; and that corollary from Galatians: 'Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.'

That Old Testament maxim held good for two hundred years after these friars were burnt. These two New Testament maxims are now so deeply rooted that I take leave to prophesy here (but under correction, of course, as throughout every word of this lecture) that they are principles which will last as long as the human race endures.*

* At the conclusion, both Lecturer and Chairman repeatedly invited criticism or confutation of the statements made, but none were forthcoming.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHURCH ON TRIAL*

Canon Barry in this book more or less endorses the views of such writers as Mr. John Strachey and Mr. J. H. Laski that the present economic system is displaying manifest signs of breakdown.

> 'Capitalism as at present organised has broken down in the sphere of economics, and it has poisoned and corrupted politics. It has failed to deliver or distribute the goods, and the feverish efforts of the last decade to keep alive the capitalistic system have intensified its dangers in politics, but without redeeming its economic failure . . . The moral indictment of the existing system is not more scathing or more obvious than its own economic incompetence to meet the necessities of a changing world . . . The attempts that are being made to adjust it to contemporary historical conditions are even more morally disastrous. Fascism is the next stage ahead of it. The inevitable trend of the process is towards a capitalism of monopoly organised on a nationalistic basis, which means in effect economic imperialism, as ruthless and as unscrupulous as warfare.'

This sober analysis will be rejected only by those whom invincible ignorance or some form of terror of the truth has blinded. But what is to be done about it? Are the bishops of the Church of England to form themselves into a Committee of Union and Progress? Canon Barry advocates no such measure.

> 'There is no complete Christian programme for the re-constitution of society. The spirit of Christ offers no direction in respect of detailed conduct or policy in the circumstances of the twentieth century. What it offers is a judgment redeemed and a will consecrated to the Father and access to regenerative resources which can resist the wearing down pressure of moral inertia and disappointment. It offers men vision and it confers fidelity. The task of the Church is . . . to supply that spiritual dynamic which can bring the schemes (of statesmen) to victorious fulfilment.'

What is needed is not for churchmen to inaugurate a political crusade, but something much more difficult and fundamental. The world — or, to narrow things down a little, the nation — certainly needs economic reorganization, but 'its deepest need is for a society to revive within it which rules its life by spiritual convictions.'

> 'The root cause of our present confusion is that politics, economics and ethics are in no true relation to one another and are all unrelated to religion. Our civilisation has no centre.'

Here, then, is a worthy rôle for the Church to play — that of the community's spiritual centre which inspires and invigorates the whole. At the moment, of course, the lack of any such spiritual centre creates the demand for some substitute — to an increasing degree the omnicompetent State. National Socialism, or Fascism, or (in Russia) Marxism, is the new religion, binding all together into a social organism of first-class fighting efficiency.

Canon Barry says that individualism in religion is helpless against any of these totalitarian forms of State power. A Church is necessary:

> 'Christianity can barely survive amid the intolerant blizzards of

* *The Relevance of the Church.* By F. R. Barry. (Nisbet. 1935. 7/6.)

mass rule, such as threatens its existence in Europe and may yet sweep across our own land, save as a society conscious of itself and organized by its own transcendent allegiance. Nothing but a revival of the Church can withstand the usurpations of Caesarism.'

But what is the individual to do? Is he to sink himself in his Church loyalty as deeply and uncritically as the devotee of the Great Leviathan? Are we to submit to bishop or pope as in the political sphere men submit to dictators? Is all independence of thought to be sternly suppressed? Is everything to be sacrificed to discipline? This problem of the individual and his Church is a very important one, and it is not solved merely by saying that individualism is not enough. No one supposes that it is. But neither is submergence of the individual enough, for (what is so often forgotten) the individual is the growing-point of the community. If a plant nips its growing-points, it ceases to grow — life ceases to flow through it and it dies. The trouble with the Church at present is that the creative forces of life are no longer flowing through it in any full and unrestricted manner. Canon Barry himself deplores the fact that

'the Churches as we know them in Britain are predominantly middle-aged societies, and much that is most hopeful and promising in contemporary life and religion stands in no conscious relation to them. Unless the process can be redirected, the Churches will soon cease to count at all. They must face a steadily declining membership in which the death-rate far exceeds the birth-rate; and while they last they must be the least adventurous elements in religion.'

Although it is fashionable to deny it, the root trouble is intellectual — though of course the intellectual trouble is moral at bottom, since it is a moral failing that makes an institution or an individual acquiesce in the presence of a lie in the soul. It is not so much that a Church which cannot give us a credible creed will not give us a workable system of economics; it cannot be a source of inspiration or a centre for spiritual loyalties.

Canon Barry does not overlook this problem of the individual and tradition. He says, rightly, that

'the pioneer in the arts and sciences owes his epoch-making discovery to the tradition which he supersedes.'

In a word, tradition produces the creative individual, and he in turn enriches the tradition. But what if the tradition refuses to house the creative individual, but insists on casting him out, or (what is worse) insists on his declaring at the age of twenty-three that he will modify his religious beliefs in no important particular? What if the tradition declines to be enriched, declaring that it already possesses all riches, and that to say otherwise is to be guilty of blasphemy?

The truth is that a tradition which is alive is like a tree continually putting forth new leaves; whereas a tradition which is dying or dead ceases to produce new leaves to replace those which have fallen off. Those (and they are many) who seek to prove that such a tree is alive busy themselves picking up the fallen leaves and striving to stick them to the branches again. But glue and leaves alike are soon blown or washed off by the elements.[1]

Canon Barry is alive to what may be termed the professional obstacles to the realisation of his ideals for the Church. The official mind is ever with us, and increases in prestige as inspiration declines. Moreover, vested

† I owe this lively simile to Mr. T. S. Eliot.

interests arise even in the most holy places — even in the Temple there were those who sold oxen and doves. Holy men are but human. 'It is the very utmost importance,' writes our author, 'to keep our thought of the Church uncontaminated by the virus of the "ecclesiastical" mind.'

Canon Barry is himself an optimist and is not without hope that the Church will rise to meet its opportunities in a time of acute crisis such as that which is now upon us. Were Canon Barry himself a typical Churchman the outlook indeed would be less sombre; but his two books are being widely read and will have a great influence. The writer of this review heard this volume commended to the clergy at an episcopal visitation, and though it was the chapters on Worship that were particularly praised, his Lordship said nothing to warn the reader off other parts of the book.

Modern Churchmen will be grateful to Canon Barry for an outspoken tribute:

> 'It has been the great contribution of the Liberal School in the Church of England to keep alive an essential protest against excessive rigidity and formalism. By its scholarship and historical research it has undermined many of those assumptions on which rigid theories have been based. It has been the brave champion of freedom. Against obscurantists on both wings it has stood for the claim of intellectual liberty. To it chiefly we owe the vindication of biblical and historical criticism and a scrupulous regard for the laws of evidence.'

This is an honest, outspoken book, and should do a world of good.

J. C. HARDWICK.

MILTON*

Mr. Hilaire Belloc is a case for legislation *ad hoc;* so sings the poet, and certainly there are moments when the reader of Mr. Belloc's serious works feels that he would vote for an act of attainder or some equally summary process of getting rid of him. But there are moments when he feels quite differently. We know of no contemporary writer who can be alternately so delightful and so provoking. There are times when he is not only perverse but even to all appearance stupid. Time was when historical students used to point out his mistakes in matters of fact; they have long ago given it up; life is not long enough, and the effect produced on Mr. Belloc and his public is imperceptible; as easy would it be to wound the loud winds or kill the still-closing waters as to diminish his cheerful cocksureness. Read as he should be read, with a firm resolve never to take his word for any fact, he is abundantly stimulating and even instructive.

Mr. Belloc brings one great advantage to the study of English history: he is a foreigner, sufficiently acclimatised to English life to be able to understand it, in the way a foreigner understands things, and to notice things which we English do not notice. This may seem rather a bold statement to make of one who has passed, we understand, nearly all his life in this country, has made a name in our literature, and has sat in our national Parliament. But the same might have been said of Benjamin Disraeli, who lived all his life in England. Mr. Belloc's novels bear a curious resemblance to Disraeli's.

The present volume, we are told, is not a life of Milton; it is a study of the Miltonic episode in English letters. Its main thesis is that it was Milton's poetry and above all 'Paradise Lost' that stamped upon the body

* *Milton.* By Hilaire Belloc. (Cassell and Company Ltd. 1935. 12/-.)

of English letters for three hundred years the seal of Protestantism. Milton tried to do two things, to make English literature classical and to make it Protestant; in the first attempt he failed, in the second he succeeded. Such is the verdict of our intelligent foreigner, and it is worthy of serious consideration. Especially would we commend to the *Church Times* and to English Roman Catholics the outsider's view that modern England is essentially Protestant.

It follows from what we have said that Mr. Belloc's feelings towards Milton are decidedly mixed; as Milton was a classicist he loves him, as he was a poet he honours him, but as he was a Puritan he abhors him. True, he is not altogether free from the modern heresy which treats Milton's minor poems, his 'Lycidas' and his Sonnets as his chief title to fame, and not his one stupendous achievement, 'Paradise Lost.' For our part, we always feel that putting 'Lycidas' above 'Paradise Lost' is like putting 'Venus and Adonis' above 'King Lear.' The one extraordinary lapse, for so we must consider it, in this study is Mr. Belloc's blank want of appreciation of 'Paradise Regained,' for which he expresses almost unmixed contempt. It is idle to argue about these things: we will quote a few lines.

> 'Such forces met not, nor so wide a camp,
> When Agrican with all his northern powers
> Besieged Albracca, as romances tell,
> The city of Gallaphrone, from whence to win
> The fairest of her sex Angelica,
> His daughter, sought by many prowest knights,
> Both Paynim, and the peers of Charlemain.'

We conceive that Mr. Belloc is prejudiced against 'Paradise Regained' on theological grounds. He takes offence at the speech which Milton puts into the mouth of Satan containing the line,

> 'For Son of God to me is yet in doubt.'

Milton has usually been criticised for not making Satan diabolical enough. There is a story of an eighteenth century nobleman who was persuaded by his chaplain to read 'Paradise Lost,' and who having finished the first book, said of Satan, 'He is a damned fine fellow, and I hope he'll win.' The Prince of Darkness is, we know, a gentleman, but it is too much to expect to find him an orthodox gentleman. Milton, like everyone else who tries to treat the story of the Temptation literally, is embarrassed by what would seem to be the incredible audacity of the Devil in tempting the Son of God, and not unnaturally resorts to the expedient, for which he could quote good patristic authority, of making Satan uncertain as to our Lord's true nature. It is not an article of faith that the Devil is omniscient.

The publication in 1823 of the *De Doctrina,* translated at George IV's command by his Chaplain Sumner, made clear what had long been suspected by intelligent readers that Milton was an Arian. During the latter half of the seventeenth century Arian or semi-Arian views were very prevalent: Locke and Sir Isaac Newton, for example, were both at least suspected of Arianism. Mr. Belloc, however, is quite wrong in calling him a Unitarian; there is no etymological or logical connexion between the two. Trinitarians claim to be Unitarian in the true sense; it is in the Collect for Trinity Sunday that we pray for grace not only to acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity, but in the power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity.

Milton, says Mr. Belloc, is disingenuous in saying that the text of the

Three Witnesses is absent from the greater part of the ancient Greek manuscripts. To us it seems that Milton is guilty, if of anything, of an understatement. It reminds us of the remark of a certain divine, 'There is little doubt that large portions of our English Bible were originally written in foreign tongues.' As a matter of fact, the verse is not found in any ancient Greek manuscript. Such, at least, was the opinion of Richard Porson. In his Letters to Archdeacon Travis he sums up his opinion of the alleged ancient manuscripts in the following trenchant terms:—

> 'I am compelled to decide (with sorrow I pronounce it) that they have disappeared; perhaps they were too good for this world, and therefore are no longer visible on earth. However, I advise the true believers not to be dejected; for since all things lost from earth are treasured up in the lunar sphere, they may rest assured that these valuable relics are safely deposited in a snug corner of the moon, fit company for Constantine's Donation, Orlando's wits, and Dr. Travis's learning' (Letter IV, p. 87).

Indeed, Mr. Belloc is most unfortunate in correcting Milton, and one trembles to think of the epithets which he would have drawn on his head from the irascible poet. Milton, he tells us, could read not only Greek and Latin but 'Hebrew too, or "the Chaldee" as he will have it.' Where in the name of goodness does Milton call Hebrew Chaldee? Chaldee or Aramaic, as we now call it, was sometimes called Hebrew; it is called so once or twice in the New Testament; it had become by that time the common speech of the Hebrews. But that John Milton called Hebrew Chaldee we shall believe when Mr. Belloc gives us chapter and verse. Again, he censures Milton for pedantically writing Hebrew without the 'h'; but Shakespeare makes Sir John Falstaff, who was surely not a pedant, talk of 'an Ebrew Jew.'

Every critic of Milton has made merry over the fact that, as Byron says, the first Mrs. Milton left the house. Less has been said about the disruption of the marriage of our other great poet, perhaps because in that case it was Mr. Shakespeare who left the house. To Mr. Belloc, Milton figures as the protagonist of the attack on the Catholic theory of the indissolubility of marriage. We should have thought that for practical purposes polygamy and polyandry flourished pretty rankly at the Courts of the crypto-Catholic Charles II and the Most Christian King, Louis XIV. Dryden in the opening lines of 'Absalom and Achitophel' plainly intimates that his Sovereign, like the patriarch David, had his seraglio; and his example was followed by his courtiers, who were in no danger of being infected by the pernicious teaching of the blind Roundhead in Artillery Walk. That fidelity to the marriage vow is ridiculous is the underlying assumption of the whole Restoration comedy. And if that assumption is made, the formal indissolubility of marriage becomes something of a farce. Milton, like Shelley, held views of the relations of the sexes which are open to serious objection, but it is fundamentally false to represent either of them as an advocate of licence.

We would not part with Mr. Belloc in ill-humour: thanks to him we have read 'Paradise Regained' once more, and we have found it even finer than we remembered. And there is a sentence in his chapter on 'Paradise Lost' for the sake of which we could forgive much:

> 'For indeed Milton's effect is the effect of a voice somewhere passionately loved, now heard again, and recalling beatitude.'

GAMALIEL MILNER.

ANCIENT CIVILIZATION IN INDIA*

One of the most astonishing results of recent excavations has been the discovery at Harappa and Mohenzo-daro in the Indus Valley in India of a civilization as ancient as the civilization of Sumeria and worthy to be compared with it. The discovery, as V. Gordon Childe has shown in his book *New Light on the Most Ancient East* (1934), has thrown new light on the cultures and contacts of the Ancient East. Of the two Indus cities, Mohenzo-daro seems to have been smaller than Harappa, but so far its yield of antiquities has been richer. It is this richness of material that has made it more prominent and has induced Dr. Mackay, who was in charge of the excavations at Mohenzo-daro for six years, to concentrate upon this site in a recently published book.

The date of the Indus civilization has now been fixed with some degree of certainty, for objects found during the excavations now proceeding in Mesopotamia have been identified as of Indian workmanship.

> 'It is enough to say here that the upper levels of Mohenzo-daro are contemporaneous with the latter part of the Early Dynastic Period of Babylonia, *c.* 2550 B.C., while the lower levels, as far as we have descended, where the objects found are barely distinguishable from those of the latest levels, could hardly antedate the latter by more than five hundred years, and perhaps as little as three hundred. The dating of the upper levels is now accepted by most authorities, but it must be remembered that it depends on Mesopotamian chronology, and that any modification of the latter must entail a corresponding re-dating of the Indus Valley finds.'

The people who built Mohenzo-daro and Harappa were a pre-Aryan race,

> 'for their cities were flourishing some thousand years before any Aryan-speaking people had entered India, an event which took place, according to modern ruling, about 1500 B.C.'

Immigrants or invaders, they were already highly civilized before they entered the Indus Valley, and they lived there long enough to establish well-built cities and to make their own certain religious practices rooted in the soil of India, such as the worship of animals and trees and the use of phallic symbols. Indeed, one of the most interesting discoveries is a figure which Sir John Marshall has identified with the Indian god who came to be known in later times as Shiva, or as Parsupati, Lord of Beasts. The figure appears on a seal-amulet, where he is depicted as a nude deity with horns and three faces, seated on a stool with his heels pressed closely together in what is evidently a religious attitude.

> 'Surrounding him are a number of animals—two deer, or antelopes, a rhinoceros, an elephant, a tiger, and a buffalo. The figure wears a large number of bangles on either arm, after the fashion of some of the female goddesses on the amulets, and a fan-shaped erection, very like the head-dress worn by many of the female figurines, rises from his head between horns resembling those of a bull or buffalo.'

No building which can properly be described as a temple has been discovered so far in Mohenzo-daro or in Harappa, but buildings have been found which seem to have had some religious use. For instance, in

* *The Indus Civilization*. By Dr. Mackay. (Lovat Dickson & Thompson Ltd. 1935. 6/- net.)

Mohenzo-daro there is a building which consists of a large bath, surrounded by a cloistered walk. There is also at its northern end a group of eight small bathrooms. Now the world over, a magico-religious significance has been ascribed to water, and anyone who has visited India must have felt that nowhere has bathing in this sacred life-giving element been more highly esteemed. That the practice goes back to very ancient times can hardly be doubted. Dr. Mackay has good reason therefore to say :

> 'It seems likely that ceremonial bathing was part of the religion of the people of Mohenzo-daro, as it still is among Hindus to-day, and that the large bath was the place where the people performed this ritual. The eight small rooms may have been used by the priests in charge of the building, a theory which appears to be substantiated by the presence of a cell above each room.'

It is likely that, as in Egypt, even the toilet ablution was regarded as a religious ceremony. Practically every house had its bathroom. This was always placed on the street side of the building for the convenient disposal of water. In this connection it is interesting to note that the method of drainage adopted by the Indus Valley people, which is especially well preserved at Mohenzo-daro, 'is certainly the most complete ancient system as yet discovered.'

Many pottery figurines, almost invariably in a damaged condition, have been found. These seem to represent the Mother Goddess, who in ancient times was worshipped so widely in the Near and Middle East.

> 'The poorer and more illiterate people probably found a deity like the Mother Goddess easier to understand and worship than any other. In India to-day she is the guardian of the house and village, presides over child-birth, and, taking a more human interest in their needs, is altogether closer to her worshippers than any of the recognized Hindu gods. It seems likely that she was so regarded by the inhabitants of the Indus Valley, but whether she was considered in those days to be one of a trinity—that is, with a male counterpart and a son—or whether she was worshipped alone, as in many villages to-day, is still unknown.'

In any case, male figurines made of clay, which may very well represent the consort of the Mother Goddess, are among the discoveries in the Indus Valley.

M. A. Canney.

FAITH AND FACT*

Mr. Alan Richardson is insistent that Christianity is a historical religion, based on the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Christian doctrine is no mere system of ideas unrelated to history. Christianity is 'the living response of our whole personality to Jesus,' and the data of the theologian are the facts about the historical Jesus. From this standpoint he has expounded the doctrines of the Incarnation, Trinity, and Atonement, in a short book intended mainly for readers with no previous theological training, who require an introduction to the study of Christian doctrine. It serves its purpose admirably, is clearly arranged, and is expressed in non-technical language.

* *Creeds in the Making.* By Alan Richardson. (The Student Christian Movement Press. 1935. Price 2/6 net.)

Jesus inspired in his disciples a veneration almost amounting to worship; but Christianity was not founded on the memory of a leader, however revered; it was founded on the belief in the resurrection. This is a belief which is vitally relevant to-day, for it provides the key to the meaning of the universe. Christian doctrine had its birth in the attempt to explain the first disciples' experience of the Risen Christ.

Starting from this point, Mr. Richardson traces the process by which the Church, impelled to definition by the rise of a succession of heresies, each of which was subversive of New Testament Christianity, arrived at the Chalcedonian Definition.

He is aware of the danger of putting new wine into old bottles, but he is also fully conscious of the urgent necessity of putting the old wine into new bottles. The old wine is the essential truth enshrined in the classical doctrinal formularies. He sees that the old bottles are in some ways unsuitable for use to-day. The Chalcedonians, by differing too drastically between Godhead and manhood, made the problem of incarnation unnecessarily difficult. Their psychology was inadequate and laid a disproportionate emphasis on the animal side of human nature. They used cold impersonal categories, whereas personal ones are more appropriate to the subject-matter. Mr. Richardson attaches primary importance to a re-awakening to the full significance of the ancient doctrine of God as Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit reveals a vision of a redeemed world.

> 'This vision of the goal towards which the Spirit of God tirelessly leads mankind is the blessing which he offers to us through the prophets of our race and by which he encourages us to renewed effort towards fuller co-operation with him. It is this vision which inspires and animates what would otherwise be the dry bones of the Church's theology; for Christian doctrine is merely the vessel in which the inspiration has been conveyed: it is now our task to purvey it in new vessels to our own perplexed and groping generation.'

G. L. H. Harvey.

THE CARE OF CHURCHES*

This book is sub-titled 'A Manual of Self-help for all who are interested in our Churches,' and deals with the upkeep and repair of their fabric and furniture. It is arranged alphabetically, under fifty headings, which include such diverse subjects as Alabaster, Beetle (Cause and Cure), Colouring Stone, Ferramenta, Guide Books, Organ Sites, Paint Removal, Statuary, Tell-tales (those designed to show movement in cracked walls, not the human variety), Victorian Furniture and White Limewash. The hints given are practical and in good taste; they acknowledge considerable debt to the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, to the Secretary of which, Mr. A. R. Powys, the book is dedicated.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the priest who considers that his care is that of immortal souls and their training for eternity, should be met with these words on the wrapper:

> 'A Priest is the Trustee for the future ages. It is his care of the church's fabric which will remain a permanent feature of his ministry.'

Presumably, however, publisher rather than author is to be blamed for this.

W. H. Oldaker.

* *The Care of Churches.* By Nevil Truman. (Philip Allan. 1935. Price 3/6.)

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.'*

It has recently been urged upon me by a younger clerical member of the Modern Churchmen's Union that Modernism in the English Church would make rapid headway among 'the masses' if we had a cheap and simple publication. Dean Inge's articles in the *Evening Standard* have, of course, been invaluable to us, but a specifically religious paper or leaflet, such as could be inserted each month in parish magazines, ought to find both ready appreciation and sale. I wonder if you will consider producing such a publication? A four, or even a two page leaflet would, I think, serve the purpose. I myself should appreciate some 'signs of the times,' a simple exposition of some point of doctrine and outlines of Sunday School lessons for the month. Others will perhaps have different ideas. Do you think you could obtain the opinion of the readers of the *Modern Churchman* on the desirability of such a publication and on the amount of support which they would give to it? Surely every clergyman who is a member of the Union could guarantee to take at least one leaflet for each of his Sunday School teachers, and I am sure that if the publication were advertised to his congregation others among them would ask for it. R. D. RICHARDSON.

The Vicarage,
Harborne,
Birmingham, 17.
November 25th, 1935.

Such a proposal deserves support. If 250 Modernist vicars would guarantee to take not less than 100 copies monthly and each pay £2/10/0 *per annum* to cover cost of paper, printing, postage, etc., we could undertake the matter. It would be necessary, however, for the Union to organize the preliminary steps of the enterprise. Before the war we published a Modern Churchman's Parish Magazine entitled *Yesterday, To-day and For Ever,* but found it no easy matter to organize Modernist support for it. However, the times have changed, and doubtless the effort is worth making. We shall be glad to hear the views of our readers.—ED., *M.C.*

SIR, A PARSON IN REVOLT.

Mr. Micklewright has written a courteous criticism of a very imperfect article of mine on Mr. Bramley. I delight in the drive of the young radical theologians. But they are not complete; they are a factor in the Church, not the whole. 'We have need of audacity,' they say; and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, 'Ye have need of patience.' These two together are the keys of progress. In this very year there has been with us an almost dramatic advance in clerical freedom. The Bampton Lectures of 1934, preached by a chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, have been published; and (amid much reverent, positive teaching) they proclaim and accept some of the extreme negative effects of Form-criticism—a mark of clerical liberty which thirty years ago would have seemed incredible or even preposterous.

What I hope is that the younger Modernist clergy will stand at their posts; if one post becomes unbearable, will find another; will regard the mission of Modernism as a surpassing trust and at difficult times, under God, will see it through. That is what many young Modernist clergy, Mr. Micklewright among them, are doing; and on their endurance great things, in my judgment, depend.

We Modernists, if an old man may be permitted to say so, cannot too often remind ourselves that Modernism is not religion, but it is a thoughful

aid to religion; that we do not want to lead 'a Modernist life,' but that, however Modernist we may be, we want at the root of things to lead a Christian life.

HUBERT HANDLEY.

40 Woodstock Avenue, N.W.11.

SIR,

I wonder if you will allow some observations from the pen of an Anglo-Catholic on the article entitled 'A Parson in Revolt' which appears in the number of the *Modern Churchman* which has just reached me. I write as one who must be of about the same age as the writer of the article, but one to whom ten years of the ministry has evidently brought a very different experience from his.

The writer speaks throughout with no little self-confidence, and makes it plain that he considers himself the justly aggrieved party in the conflict between himself and the Church or 'Ecclesiasticism.' But, to many Churchmen I think, his own conception, or want of conception, of the meaning of the step he was taking in accepting ordination, and his own predispositions towards the work of the ministry, were largely responsible for his 'revolt.'

It is not quite clear from the article whether its writer still exercises his ministry within the church, though he was ordained priest, in circumstances in which I think many would have refused to go on. One hesitates to think what the ambiguous dictum of the Bishop's chaplain may have meant. But it is clear that from the first, Mr. Bramley claimed the right as a minister not only to believe but to teach, what he liked, determined, as he says, to stick to his own intuitions on questions of religion through thick and thin: and this claim, he infers, is the characteristic of the prophet, in revolt against the priests. He emphasizes more than once this right to complete independence—'to strike out for myself': and does not hesitate to affirm infallibility, at least in his own eyes, for his religious intuitions.

But has not Mr. Bramley confused two, or three, quite distinct claims? There is the claim that every man has a right to his own judgment in spiritual matters. This is a claim which it is quite futile to dispute, and few Anglicans would wish to dispute it, providing the claimant has the capacity and the humility to understand and pay some attention to the matters he is making judgment upon—a none too frequent combination of qualities in those who claim the right of independent judgment. There is the claim to persuade others, by lawful means, to one's own intuitions. This again no one will deny. But Mr. Bramley makes a third claim, namely, to stand as the accredited representative of a corporate society, and proclaim the utterances of his own intuitions, not only without reference to, but in strong resentment of, the restrictions which the corporate principles of doctrine or the practice of the society may impose.

One cannot but think that Mr. Bramley would have spared himself and the Church much difficulty if he had faced this choice between the offices of prophet and priest or 'ecclesiastic' (which he seems to think irreconcilable), *before* rather than after his ordination. His article does not suggest that he had paid much attention to the principles and conditions of ministry in the Church of England as set out in the Prayer Book. He had some ideas of what *he* thought a minister should be: to his own mind they were largely analogous with what he thought was the office of the prophet. How far the picture of one whose intuitions are to be drawn 'from Nature and Life,' can bring himself to write that he fancied his possibilities as a preacher, and talk easily at the age of thirty or so of cutting down deep into life and wrestling with its many problems for the benefit of his hearers, who could

spend two years using Morning Prayer (even if two only were present) with so little apparent spiritual apprehension as the remarks on page 84 betray, corresponds with the picture of those great men, from Amos to Saint Paul, who achieved in wrestling of prayer and stern discipline experience of a Living God, and even then only with fear and trembling, and under the restraint of a divine compulsion, dared to speak in His Holy Name, is a matter for consideration. But the point I would submit is, that if Mr. Bramley claims for himself as a prophet the right to teach *within the Church* his own intuitions unrestrictedly, he is making a claim which I hesitate to think even the most advanced Modernist would concede to be just.

I, for one, can understand the man who says 'the whole Church system is wrong. Let every man hold, and if any will listen teach, his own convictions,' and keep clear of Churches altogether. One can sympathise with the man who, either before or after ordination, finds that the deliverances of his private judgment do not accord in detail with the official utterances of the Church: and is faced with the problem of conscience involved. One can understand the man who would wish the tests of admission to the ministry other than they are. But I hesitate to think that Modernists as a whole subscribe to the claim that every individual may, as a minister of the Church, claim an absolute right for the intuitions of his own soul. I cannot but feel that if a man accepts ministry within a Church, he *is* bound, very seriously, by the doctrinal formulae of that Church to which he subscribes: and, when his own 'intuitions' differ from such formulae, to suppress his 'intuitions' in official teaching (*i.e.* preaching in church *at least*) until such a position becomes conscientiously intolerable, as it will become when the 'intuition' becomes a conviction, and then to face the question whether he can or cannot continue a minister of the Church in question. I forbear to prejudge the question which way that problem should be decided. It is evident that in the Church of England many decide that it *is* possible to retain their ministry while convinced of the untruth of parts of that Church's formulae. But my question is this. Do Modernists, or others, who decide in this sense, do so as repudiating every right of the Church to impose doctrinal tests upon her ministers: or simply as believing that in the particular matter of difference, let us say the Virgin Birth, it is the Church's mind to allow liberty? There is a most important distinction.

The *Modern Churchman* recently claimed liberty to follow the argument whithersoever it may lead: a liberty most would concede, though, in view of the fallibility of human powers of judgment, one to be used with extreme care. But do Modern Churchmen claim the right to *remain churchmen*, wherever the argument may have led? still further, to accept or retain the position of the accredited teachers of the Church, wherever it may have led? One trusts that they claim, in general, nothing so preposterous: but such a claim is certainly to be inferred from the petulant resentment of any form of regulation and lofty condemnation of others' beliefs, betrayed by the contributor of your article. Yet the publication of the article suggests that the writer has at least the warm sympathy of the Editor of the *Modern Churchman*. The suggestion is that Mr. Bramley is one deserving our commiseration, the now liberated victim of ecclesiasticism. To another, who, like yourself Sir, was once entrusted with the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders, the article suggests rather the picture of a fretful child, whose Vicar was not so far wrong when he pointed him to the teaching of St. Paul concerning the Body of Christ and personal humility: though one hopes that the 'cog' simile is rather Mr. Bramley's paraphrase of the Vicar's admonition than the Vicar's own use.

I think Mr. Bramley will forgive frank speech: he has claimed it for himself, and has not spared either his Vicar or Bishop, who are presumably alive!

C. W. ALDERSON.

U.M.C.A., Manda,
Tanganyika Territory.

Of course Modernists do not 'repudiate every right of the Church to impose doctrinal tests upon her ministers.' They do maintain that it is most important, in view of modern difficulties and problems, that the authorities of the Church should interpret the doctrinal formularies in the spirit rather than in the letter, so as to comprehend and not exclude. Many Modernists also are convinced that it is high time that our doctrinal formularies were simplified so as to exclude from them a number of statements which are either doubtful or even untrue. The church authorities themselves must judge whether the individual clergyman who is following the argument whithersoever it leads has got beyond the boundaries of Christian truth. What the Modernists urge in this matter is the duty of the clergyman to be unreservedly honest with his Bishop. We publish many articles in the *Modern Churchman*, not because we agree with all that the writers affirm, but because what they write seems to us to deserve attention. One of our aims in coming into existence was to break the conspiracy of silence. Mr. Bramley, we ought to add, is a naval chaplain, on active service.—ED., *M.C.*

SIR, THE RESURRECTION AND PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

What is the bearing of the facts discovered by Psychical Research on the Resurrection of Jesus Christ? To what conclusions do they lead?

1. Man has a spiritual body which is liberated at death from the physical form, and that is his real resurrection, but it cannot be touched or seen by physical organs.

2. After liberation it is possible, under certain conditions, to manifest to physical senses by materialising a temporary form.

3. This is formed by means of forces drawn from physical bodies.

4. The bodies thus used have been proved to lose weight in the process.

5. If the Lord Jesus desired thus to manifest Himself it is probable that He withdrew these forces from His physical corpse and that the withdrawal caused a complete collapse of the form—a *complete* loss of weight. So the grave clothes lay flat and the tomb was practically empty.

All this is probable in the light of the discoveries of careful psychical researchers. In that case His materialisation is no longer a puzzle, it is a supreme instance of facts of modern experience, unknown to those who decline to investigate them, but *proved* under test conditions over and over again.

H. A. DALLAS.

PS.—The inverted commas in the letter over my name in the July *Modern Churchman* have been misplaced, and the order in my letter has been reversed. The correct quotation from Bishop Stubbs is as follows:—

> 'One great necessity of practical judgment is patience and tolerance and . . . the highest justice must be content for a time to see many things continue wrong that cannot be righted without a greater wrong.'

The rest is my comment.

H.A.D.

9 Perryfield Road,
Crawley, Sussex.

CORRECTION.

On p. 137, line 21, readers are requested to substitute *Anglo-Catholic* for *Romanizing*, and to accept Dr. Coulton's apologies for having sent the correction too late for the Conference number.

[We regret that pressure on our space has prevented publication of a number of letters and has led to compression of others.—ED., *M.C.*]

WHAT TO BELIEVE

by

J. C. HARDWICK

Just Published
7/6 net

Of all Booksellers & Libraries
SIMPKIN MARSHALL, LTD.

FOR CLUBS AND READING ROOMS

A SPECIAL OFFER of some hundreds of novels withdrawn from our Circulating Library, well read, but in fair condition, is being made during the month of December only. The terms are, the selection being left to us,

50 for £1 . 12 . 0
100 for £3 . 0 . 0

We pay carriage on all orders of £2 and over.

THE TIMES BOOK CLUB

Booksellers and Librarians

42 WIGMORE STREET, LONDON, W.1.

B. H. BLACKWELL, LTD.

UNIVERSITY BOOKSELLERS
NEW AND SECONDHAND

¶ Issue Catalogues post free in al Departments of Literature.

¶ Purchase for Cash, Books in lots, large and small.

¶ Devote special attention to the prompt execution of orders by post.

¶ Supply Foreign Books.

¶ Spare no pains to procure books out of print or scarce in any department of Literature.

¶ Punctually supply Periodicals in all Subjects and Languages, and

¶ Specialise in Bookbinding.

50 & 51 BROAD STREET, OXFORD